School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1327171

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

ST. PAUL'S EPHESIAN MINISTRY

ST. PAUL'S EPHESIAN MINISTRY

BS
2505
D83

A RECONSTRUCTION

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE EPHESIAN ORIGIN OF THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES

BY

GEORGE S. DUNCAN, B.D.

PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
LIMITED LONDON
ST. PAUL'S HOUSE
WARWICK SQUARE
E.C.
4

First Published . . . October 1929

University of Southern California

Made and Printed in Great Britain.
Hazell, Watson & Viney, Ltd., London and Aylesbury.

Religion 225.92 P329du

TM

I SHOULD LIKE BY THIS BOOK TO EXPRESS THE GRATITUDE
I FEEL TO THREE GREAT SCHOLARS AND TEACHERS

A. S. THOMSON
Forfar Academy

The late W. R. HARDIE
Edinburgh University

J. D. DUFF
Trinity College, Cambridge

WHO IN SUCCESSION TAUGHT ME TO READ THE
ANCIENT CLASSICS, AND TO WHOSE PERSONAL
INTEREST IN THE WELFARE OF THEIR
STUDENTS I OWE A DEBT I NEVER
CAN REPAY

Transferred
Methodist World Service Fund

PREFACE

Some five years ago, on the occasion of my first meeting with him, Professor Deissmann, of Berlin, asked me whether I had given any thought to the hypothesis that St. Paul's Imprisonment Epistles were written from Ephesus rather than from Rome. I told him that, though the theory was not new to me, I had so far seen little that was attractive in it. "I should like you to look into it more fully," he said, in a tone which left no doubt as to the direction in which his own mind was tending. I began to do so, and the present book is the result.

It was not long before I became convinced that the Imprisonment Epistles are all to be assigned to the three years which the apostle spent in Asia at the beginning of his 'third' missionary journey, and further that the *personalia* in the Pastoral Epistles are most naturally explained by reference to the same eventful period. But I could not rest content with this general hypothesis until, combining the new data thus provided with those already familiar to us from Acts and the Corinthian Epistles, I had worked out in some detail a reconstruction of the development of events during the Ephesian ministry, so that each of the epistles belonging to the period might be viewed in its true setting. The task has not been an easy one. Apart from the difficult process of mental readjustment involved in the attempt to transfer a multitude of detailed references from one period of Pauline activity to another, the problem is one of far too great complexity to admit of

any simple solution, as e.g. that all the epistles in question belong to one imprisonment period. In the reconstruction now put forward there is of necessity much that is tentative, and I shall be satisfied if it serve as a contribution to the study of a set of problems which have not yet received from New Testament scholars the attention which they deserve.

The general question of an Ephesian origin of the Imprisonment Epistles has been raised on various occasions in the last thirty years, and in my statement of the case I have naturally drawn freely on the arguments put forward by the writers to whom reference is made in Chapter V.

My best thanks are due to my colleague at St. Andrews, Professor H. J. Rose, with whom I had some illuminating conversations as the work was nearing completion; to Professor Dow, Emmanuel College, Toronto, and Professor Manson, New College, Edinburgh, who read sections of the manuscript and made many helpful suggestions; and to Mrs. Dow and to my wife for assistance in preparing the book for the press.

G. S. DUNCAN.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE,
ST. ANDREWS,
August 1929.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

PAGE

i. *The Period under Discussion* 1
ii. *Character and Scope of our Inquiry* 4
iii. *Methods of Inquiry* 10

Part 1

HISTORICAL NARRATIVE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF OPPOSITION

CHAPTER II

BEFORE THE EPHESIAN MINISTRY

i. *Philippi* 18
ii. *Thessalonica* 19
iii. *Corinth* 22
iv. *The Visit to Jerusalem* 24

CHAPTER III

DURING THE EPHESIAN MINISTRY

i. *Jewish Opposition* 26
ii. *Gentile Opposition* 30
iii. *Special Problems* 33

CHAPTER IV

AFTER THE EPHESIAN MINISTRY

PAGE

i. *In Macedonia and Achaia* 47
ii. *Address to the Ephesian Elders* 48
iii. *In Jerusalem* 51

Part 2

THE HYPOTHESIS OF AN EPHESIAN IMPRISONMENT

CHAPTER V

HISTORY OF CRITICAL OPINION

CHAPTER VI

DIRECT EVIDENCE OF AN EPHESIAN IMPRISONMENT

i. *New Testament Evidence* 66
ii. *Extra-canonical Evidence* 68

CHAPTER VII

EVIDENCE FOR CONNECTING THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES WITH EPHESUS

i. *The Flight of Onesimus* 72
ii. *Paul's Request for a Lodging at Colossæ* . . 74
iii. *Paul's Relations with the Colossian Church* . . 76
iv. *The Movements of Timothy and of Paul* . . 77
v. *Frequency of Communication between Paul and Philippi* 80
vi. *The Gift sent from Philippi* 82
vii. *The 'Conflict' of Phil. i.* 30 86

CHAPTER VIII

ARGUMENTS AGAINST CONNECTING THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES WITH ROME

CHAPTER IX

THE SILENCE OF ACTS REGARDING AN EPHESIAN IMPRISONMENT

PAGE

i. *Other Omissions in Acts* 95
ii. *The Motive behind the Writing of Acts* . . . 96
iii. *The Proconsul at Ephesus* 100

CHAPTER X

OBJECTIONS TO ASCRIBING THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES TO EPHESUS

i. *The References in Philippians to the 'Prætorium' and to 'Cæsar's Household'* 108
ii. *The Situation behind Colossians and Philemon* . 111
iii. *The Theological Conceptions of the Imprisonment Epistles* 115

CHAPTER XI

WAS THE IMPRISONMENT BEFORE OR AFTER 1 CORINTHIANS?—THE HYPOTHESIS OF SEVERAL IMPRISONMENTS

i. *The Evidence of 1 Corinthians* 126
ii. *The Evidence of 2 Corinthians* 131
iii. *The Evidence afforded by the Movements of Timothy* 137
iv. *The Evidence of Acts* 139
v. *Summary* 140

CHAPTER XII

THE ORDER AND HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE VARIOUS IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES

PAGE

i. *Colossians Written before the third Crisis* . . 145

ii. *Paul's Associates at the Time of Writing the Various Epistles* 146

iii. *The Progress of the Christian Movement as seen in the Various Epistles* 157

iv. *The Conditions of the Apostle's Imprisonment as seen in the Various Epistles* 159

Part 3

PAUL'S MOVEMENTS FROM EPHESUS AS A BASE

CHAPTER XIII

PAUL'S JOURNEYS TO CORINTH

i. *Paul's Plans for Visiting Corinth* 165

ii. *The 'Sorrowful Visit'* 175

iii. *From Corinth to Troas* 179

CHAPTER XIV

THE PERSONAL REFERENCES IN THE EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY

i. *Is 2 Timothy Written from Rome or from Ephesus?* . 184

ii. 2 *Tim. i.* 15–18. 187

iii. 2 *Tim. iv.* 6–8 189

iv. 2 *Tim. iv.* 9–20 191

v. *Other Personal References* 199

vi. *General Conditions behind the Personal References in the Epistles to Timothy* 200

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON 2 TIM. IV. 6–22

PAGE

i. *Do verses 6–8 and 9–22 form a Unity?* . . 209
ii. *The Relative Positions of Paul and Timothy* . . 212

CHAPTER XV

THE PERSONAL REFERENCES IN THE EPISTLE TO TITUS

Part 4

THE COLLECTION FOR THE SAINTS

CHAPTER XVI

GOVERNING IDEAS BEHIND THE COLLECTION

CHAPTER XVII

THE ORGANISATION OF THE COLLECTION

i. *Galatia* 236
ii. *Macedonia* 237
iii. *Achaia* 242
iv. *Asia* 248

Part 5

THE OPPOSITION TO PAUL

CHAPTER XVIII

THE MAIN TENDENCIES OF THE OPPOSITION TO PAUL

i. *Before the Council of Jerusalem* 253
ii. *After the Council of Jerusalem* 256
iii. *Various Manifestations of Hostility* . . . 259

CHAPTER XIX

OPPOSITION TO PAUL IN THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES

PAGE

i. *Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon* 270
ii. *Philippians* 271

CHAPTER XX

CONCLUSION

i. *Supplementary Investigations* 282
ii. *Questions of Chronology* 287
iii. *The Large Number of Letters Written from Prison* . 294
iv. *New Problems Opened Up by our Hypothesis*. . . 295

Chronological Table 298

Indices 301

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

i. *The Period under Discussion*

It was not till his so-called third missionary journey that Paul took up his quarters at Ephesus with a view to an organised missionary crusade. It goes without saying that the apostle, who had by that time established the new faith in Macedonia and Achaia, must long ere then have recognised the strategic importance of the capital city of Asia. But with regard to this we are not left merely to conjecture. The narrative of Acts xvi. 6 ff. makes it plain that when, after the Council of Jerusalem, Paul set out with Silas to revisit and confirm the churches in Southern Galatia, the next objective he had set before himself was the province of Asia; and had that plan matured, his headquarters then would certainly have been Ephesus. Something, however, happened on that occasion to lead the missionaries first of all away from Asia, and then, when they turned north, away from Bithynia, where Nicæa and Nicomedia probably attracted them as possible centres. This change of plan, with all its accompanying uncertainties, the narrator definitely attributes to divine over-ruling; and as he himself would seem to have joined the party immediately afterwards at Troas, there is good reason to believe that in this interpretation he was stating the mind of the apostle. From Troas, in obedience to a vision, Paul crossed with his companions to Macedonia, and after a period of preaching there, which was interrupted by much un-

enlightened opposition, he passed south to Achaia, where at Corinth he carried on work for about two years. The necessity arising for a visit to Jerusalem and Syrian Antioch, the apostle in passing paid a hurried visit to Ephesus, refusing a pressing invitation to stay ; and finally on his return journey he was able, in fulfilment of a long-cherished ambition, to take up residence at Ephesus, and he stayed there some three years.

The so-called second and third missionary journeys are thus one journey, interrupted by a brief visit to the Holy City and to the original base at Antioch. Like an aviator gaining experience Paul had already, from Antioch as a base, accomplished a first flight round certain provincial cities in Southern Galatia, and in this preliminary flight he had not merely found his wings and acquired the desire to fly farther, but he had also seen with renewed clearness, from the success attending his labours, that the gospel was destined for the Greek no less than for the Jew, and this conviction of his had received triumphant vindication at the Council of Jerusalem. Now he was ready for fresh conquests. Just how far his vision extended at the time of setting out it is not easy to say. It is possible that his gaze at first did not extend beyond Ephesus : after Galatia must come Asia. But the very fact that his soul was so open to receive the promptings of providential guidance, and in particular that he understood and obeyed the vision that summoned him to cross the sea, is an indication that from the outset he had something more than Asia in view : it was not merely Ephesus, the capital of Asia, that he desired to reach, but Ephesus as a centre of that Hellenistic civilisation whose influence radiated all around the Ægean Sea. Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Pisidian Antioch were after all provincial towns of

second- or third-rate importance, and what Paul now saw opening out before him was the opportunity of capturing for Jesus Christ the leading cities of the Græco-Roman world, in which the life of the market-place and the lecture-room, the army and the civil government, all met and merged, and from which issued forth streams of influence to all the ends of the earth. In course of time a fuller vision opened out before him: "I must," he said, "see Rome" (Acts xix. 21); somehow he must gain the opportunity of presenting the case for the gospel before the Roman authorities, and of winning for it, if not acceptance, at least recognition (such as Judaism had) as a *religio licita* within the Empire. But meantime the task that confronted him was the evangelisation of Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia, the three chief provinces bounding the Ægean. As events turned out, the work accomplished in Macedonia was sporadic and disjointed owing to the outbreaks of hostility which made it impossible for the apostle to remain long in any one city, and when later he was in Ephesus he realised that further missionary work would require to be carried out there.[1] But his long residence in Corinth and Ephesus secured that the other two provinces, Achaia and Asia, received much more thorough-going evangelisation; thus in 2 Cor. i. 1, the salutation includes "the saints throughout the whole of Achaia," while the account in Acts of Paul's Ephesian ministry tells us that "all the inhabitants of Asia, Jews as well as Greeks, heard the word of the Lord" (Acts xix. 10).

[1] 1 Cor. xvi. 5, where the language of the original implies a missionary tour.

ii. *Character and Scope of our Inquiry*

In the succeeding pages our inquiry is to be concerned chiefly with Paul's activity during the period of his residence in Ephesus, but we shall seek also to accompany him when, on leaving Ephesus, he makes his way through Macedonia to Corinth (Acts xx. 1–3). Much in this whole period is obscure, and in order to gain light on the development of events we shall have to give some attention to the events of the period immediately preceding. The account in Acts of Paul's Ephesian ministry, apart from the story of the riot, is strangely unsatisfactory: "the writer is here," says Sir W. M. Ramsay, "rather a picker up of current gossip, like Herodotus, than a real historian" (*St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*, p. 273). Much, however, is to be learned from the epistles of Paul belonging to this period, notably 1 and 2 Corinthians.

But in our reconstruction of the Ephesian period[1] the present writer believes that we are not limited to the sources that have just been mentioned. In recent years the view has been steadily gaining ground that, despite the silence of Acts, Paul endured at this time in Asia one or more imprisonments. The hypothesis is arresting: for if it could be established it would enable us to understand better the growth of opposition to the apostle which culminated soon in his arrest at Jerusalem, and might shed light on much that is obscure in his relations at this time with his various churches, not merely in Asia but also in Macedonia and in Achaia. But a very special interest of the hypothesis is that it provides

[1] We shall sometimes use this phrase as a convenient designation for the whole period of Paul's third missionary journey up to the time of his final visit to Corinth.

the possibility of a new setting for some, if not all, of the ' Imprisonment Epistles,'—Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Philippians. There has been much controversy as to whether these epistles should be assigned to the Cæsarean or to the Roman imprisonment, and in general it may be said that the case for Cæsarea, which has little to recommend it, would never have been seriously pressed except as a challenge to recognise certain weaknesses inherent in the attribution of the letters to Rome. But on this new hypothesis a third possibility opens before us. Will the difficulties that beset a Roman or a Cæsarean origin of the letters disappear if we assign them to an imprisonment at Ephesus ?

Something may be said here with regard to the lines along which our inquiry will proceed. At the heart of it there lies the question whether Paul suffered imprisonment (it may be once, or even oftener) during his three years' ministry in Asia, and in Part I we shall seek to establish the general probability of this thesis, showing, by an historical survey of events from the apostle's crossing to Europe until his arrest at Jerusalem, that Jewish opposition during the whole of that period pursued him with relentless fury, and was nowhere fiercer than at Ephesus.

In Part II we shall come to closer grips with the question of an Ephesian imprisonment. After surveying briefly the history of critical opinion on the matter, we shall consider how far there is evidence, in the New Testament and outside of it, in support of the hypothesis. One fact that arrests attention at the outset is that Acts, though it relates at length certain episodes in the Ephesian ministry, has not a word to say about imprisonment. For this the author may have had good reasons, but if so, we shall have to consider what they were. Despite

the silence of Acts, however, direct evidence is not altogether lacking—there is, indeed, much more of it than has been generally supposed. Naturally such evidence is not so strong as might be desired—had it been stronger, the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment would not have been a novelty of twentieth-century criticism, and there would have been less need for an attempt like the present to build the case up stage by stage by a process of inferential reasoning. By far the strongest argument comes from a study of the Imprisonment Epistles ; and in Chapters VII and VIII we shall show how, viewed from a variety of angles, these epistles are very much more intelligible if regarded as written, not from Rome, but from Ephesus. In the case of Philippians this argument is so strong that the Ephesian origin of that letter ought to remain no longer a matter of dispute ; and it may be questioned whether the evidence is any less cogent as regards the other epistles of the group. The present study leads to the conclusion that all the Imprisonment Epistles were written from Ephesus.

A more penetrating investigation, however, will require to be undertaken if the theory of an Ephesian origin of the Imprisonment Epistles is to carry complete conviction. To what periods in the Ephesian residence are the various letters to be assigned ? In what relationships of time and circumstance do they stand, firstly to one another, and then to other epistles which were written during the same general period, notably 1 and 2 Corinthians ? In investigating these and similar problems we shall be led into the attempt to reconstruct Paul's missionary movements at this time, with special reference to the so-called ' sorrowful visit ' to Corinth and to his work in the period which imme-

diately succeeded that visit, and in this task we shall draw important evidence from an unexpected quarter, namely, the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. The general conclusion to which our inquiry leads is that during the Ephesian ministry there were *three* outbreaks of hostility, each one followed by the apostle's arrest and imprisonment.[1] During the first of these Philippians was written ; during the second, following on the riot recorded in Acts, he wrote Philemon, Colossians, and (if it is genuine) Ephesians. The third imprisonment occurred, not in Ephesus, but in an outlying part of the province, on the apostle's return to Asia after his visit to Corinth ; it was on this occasion that he wrote the letter to Timothy of which part is preserved in 2 Tim. iv. 9–22. As a final contribution to the reconstruction we shall set ourselves, with the aid of the new evidence available from the Imprisonment Epistles, to trace afresh the main historical developments of this period (so full of high hopes and tragic happenings for the apostle, for us wrapped hitherto in so much obscurity), and in particular we shall consider the question of his relationships with the various churches, the growth of Jewish opposition, and the vicissitudes attending his efforts to organise a collection for the Christians in Judæa.

With regard to the New Testament books on which our inquiry will be based we shall naturally draw evidence from Acts and from all of the epistles belonging to the period under discussion. We have said that our sources will include the Pastoral Epistles, or at least certain sections of them. Galatians, however, we shall leave out of consideration—the idea, once generally accepted,

[1] Imprisonment need not always have implied more than arrest and a restriction of his missionary activity ; cf. p. 141.

that it was written about the same time as the Corinthian Epistles rests on very insecure foundations, and the present writer is one of those who regard it as the earliest of Paul's extant letters, dating from before the Council of Jerusalem. Attempts have also been made by some scholars [1] to assign to our period the Thessalonian Epistles, but the case for this is so unconvincing that I do not propose to consider it. Special problems attach to Ephesians—its authenticity is disputed, and its impersonal tone shows that we cannot accept it merely as a letter addressed by the apostle to a church in which he had already laboured for some years. Much is to be said for the commonly accepted view that it is a circular letter addressed to the churches of Asia, and perhaps also it is to be identified with 'the letter from Laodicea' referred to in Col. iv. 16. The fact that it contains so little general information not found also in Colossians makes it less necessary for us to draw on it for evidence, and in view of the doubts regarding its genuineness it is better that we should base no argument upon it. It is clear that if it is genuine (as the present writer believes it to be) it belongs to the same general situation as Colossians; and if it was addressed to (among others) the Christians of Ephesus, that is no argument against the hypothesis that at the time of writing Paul was lying a prisoner at Ephesus, where, being temporarily under restraint, he sought to reach by his pen those whom

[1] *E.g.*, W. Michaelis, of Berlin, in his interesting and suggestive monograph *Die Gefangenschaft des Paulus in Ephesus* supporting the theory of an Ephesian imprisonment. We may note that Silas is associated with Paul in the superscription of the Thessalonian Epistles, but not in that of either of the Epistles to Corinth. In view of what we know of his share in the work at Corinth (cf. 2 Cor. i. 19), this can only mean that he was not with Paul when the Corinthian Epistles were written. The Thessalonian and the Corinthian Epistles therefore belong to different periods.

he was forbidden to address by word of mouth (cf. Eph. vi. 19).

Difficulties and complications, however, still beset us at every turn. Even if the Pauline letters are accepted in the form in which they have come down to us, the evidence which they yield is often meagre and elusive: Paul did not write his epistles to serve as historical surveys, and much that at the time was patent to their recipients is now obscure to us. But with regard to many of them the further question may be raised whether we have them in anything like their original form. In 2 Corinthians are chapters x.–xiv. part of the so-called 'sorrowful letter,' the product of a situation very different from that in which chapters i.–ix. originated? Are we, with Johannes Weiss and Goguel, to believe that various fragments of different dates are combined in 1 Corinthians? Is Philippians a composite document (the sudden break at iii. 1, 2 has for long aroused suspicion), and may it even be that we ought to assign one part to Ephesus, the other to Rome? Are we to call in question the integrity of Colossians? In Romans is chapter xvi. to be separated, according to a theory that is increasingly winning acceptance, from the earlier part of the epistle, and interpreted as part of a letter to Ephesus? Are we to recognise the existence of genuinely Pauline fragments in the Pastoral Epistles?

It is fair to say that, extravagant as some of the above hypotheses may appear, no solid objection can be urged against them on purely *a priori* grounds. Of the way in which the churches at the beginning first preserved and then interchanged the various letters in their possession we know only too little, and it is not impossible that, with the loss of certain portions, various fragments originally unrelated may have been linked

together to form an apparent unity. The possibility of this is freely accepted with regard to 2 Corinthians and Romans; why may it not also be accepted with regard to other letters? But, while willing to keep an open mind on the matter, the present writer believes that in very few cases is it necessary to sacrifice the integrity of any of the Pauline letters. He is ready to accept 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians (except perhaps as regards vi. 14–vii. 1), Colossians, and Philippians in the form in which the Church has preserved them. Part of Romans xvi., however, including the salutations, he regards as originally addressed to Ephesus. Without doubt, too, there are fragments of genuine Pauline correspondence embedded in the Pastorals.

iii. *Methods of Inquiry*

A word remains to be said regarding the methods to be followed in our inquiry. Our study is essentially an historical one, designed to shed light on those three eventful years Paul spent at Ephesus; and when in the course of our investigations we turn our attention to the Imprisonment Epistles, our inquiry will still be conducted along lines that are primarily historical. We shall not be concerned, except in a secondary way, with the literary style of the epistles or with the doctrinal ideas which are expressed in them; rather by a patient study of the historical factors we shall inquire what is the precise situation which lies behind each of the letters, and what is the period of Paul's activity to which it ought to be assigned. In such an investigation our method of procedure will be not unlike that of a detective, who, collecting his data from every quarter, concentrates attention primarily on definitely ascertained facts, and knows that the weightiest evidence is often provided

by circumstances which in themselves are trifling and have no apparent bearing on the matter under examination. Thus, for example, where was Paul, at Rome or at Ephesus, when he asked that in a little town in Asia Minor a lodging should be looked out for him (Philem. 22)? Along what route had he been travelling, and at what place had he now arrived, when he informed Timothy, who presumably was in Ephesus, that he had left Trophimus sick at Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20)? Cannot we, out of the multifarious references (in Acts and the Epistles) to Timothy, Luke, Aristarchus, Aquila and Priscilla, and others, trace with fair accuracy the movements of these various friends of the apostle, and finally use our results to shed light on the movements of the apostle himself?

Such are some of the clues which in our inquiry we shall seek to follow up. Evidence of this kind has one very special value—it belongs to the innocent and stubborn variety which refuses to be bent to the support of any theory. Too often in problems of New Testament Introduction the issue has been prejudged by critics who, before they gave due weight to the historical data, were ready to frame theories on evidence of a less positive kind. There are two lines in particular along which this tendency has manifested itself:

(*a*) A favourite clue has been that of literary affinity. Thus, while accepting the prevailing view that the Imprisonment Epistles were all written from Rome, Lightfoot favoured the theory that Philippians was the earliest of the group because of its kinship in tone and language with the epistles written in the period immediately preceding. In recognising this literary kinship Lightfoot showed his usual soundness of instinct, for, if our reconstruction is accepted, Philippians was written from

Ephesus some little time before 1 Corinthians. But the literary affinity it has with those other letters provides in itself no *proof*—it lacks the positive character which would give it first-class value as circumstantial evidence ; and no good case could be made out on the strength of it for dating Philippians some months earlier than the other Imprisonment Epistles.

(*b*) New Testament criticism has too often shackled itself by undue subservience to theories of doctrinal development. In this respect there has been indeed a big emancipation since the days of the Tübingen School ; but the process is still far from complete. Galatians, with its developed teaching on the relation of the Law and the Gospel, cannot possibly, we are told, precede in date the more primitive theology of Thessalonians ; and Colossians must be placed so many years later than the Corinthian Epistles because it elaborates a new Christology. When will criticism learn to appreciate the elementary fact that Paul wrote his letters, not primarily to systematise his latest views on theology, but rather to deal in a living way with certain practical issues (some of which of course involved questions of doctrine) in his various churches ? And while these issues naturally differed in each case and demanded from him a different method of treatment, his own theology was far deeper and fuller than at any one time he cared to express.

We are far from asserting that in a study such as the present, where questions will be raised regarding the date and historical setting of the various Imprisonment Epistles, nothing is to be gained from a careful study of the linguistic and doctrinal features of the epistles in question. But we do say emphatically that arguments

based on alleged affinities of vocabulary or of doctrine may, if used unwarily, lead to very misleading results. In a problem that is primarily historical such evidence ought never to be used to provide in itself a sure basis for exact conclusions. It may, however, as we shall show in our concluding chapter, possess both interest and value in corroborating in a general way results which have been reached on other grounds.

Part 1

HISTORICAL NARRATIVE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF OPPOSITION

CHAPTER II

BEFORE THE EPHESIAN MINISTRY

THE first part of our inquiry will be devoted to an historical *résumé* of the events of the period under discussion, and in view of the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment we shall give special attention to the hostility which the Christian movement awakened among both Jews and Greeks. The unsatisfactory character of the narrative in Acts of the Ephesian ministry makes it all the more necessary that we should try as far as possible to set the few data that we have in the right perspective; and in view of the essential continuity between the so-called 'second' and 'third' missionary journeys we begin by tracing the development of events between Paul's first crossing to Europe and his arrival some two or three years later at Ephesus.

From the very outset of his missionary work in Europe Paul was confronted with an opposition of so violent a character that he may well have been tempted to question the providential character of the call in obedience to which he had sailed from Troas. Much of the opposition was of a kind to which there had been no parallel in his previous experience. In city after city the appearance of the missionaries was the occasion for a popular riot, and the fury of the mob was so violent that at Philippi the unfortunate victims were imprisoned and flogged without a trial, while at Thessalonica and Berœa they had to save themselves by a hurried retreat under escort.

i. *Philippi*

At Philippi, according to the Acts, the immediate cause of the outburst was that, by an act of exorcism performed in the name of the Most High God, Paul robbed certain fortune-tellers of a profitable source of income. But the proportions which the disturbance subsequently assumed show that for the real explanation we must look deeper. As the charge laid before the prætors reveals, the hostility was occasioned by the fact that the missionaries were Jews, and Jews who (it was alleged) were disloyal to Rome. Here then, as opposed to the purely Jewish hostility of the earlier period, we have opposition which in origin is not Jewish, but pagan, indeed anti-Jewish ; and for its ultimate source we look not to Jerusalem, but to Rome.

Shortly before this, outbursts of Messianic fervour among the Jewish populace in Rome had been so alarming to the Imperial authorities that Claudius finally issued an edict [1] expelling all Jews from the city. The date of the edict probably fell only a very little time before Paul's arrival in Europe. Orosius says that it belongs to the 9th year of Claudius's reign, *i.e.* A.D. 49 ; and with this agrees the fact that Paul, when he arrived at Corinth (probably in the year 50) found two victims of the edict, Aquila and Priscilla, who had 'recently' arrived. So drastic a measure, even though it was probably not strictly enforced except in the case of alleged ringleaders, must have provoked considerable resentment among the peace-loving Jews who had neither participated in nor sympathised with the disturbances which had occasioned it. Of the exiled Jews many naturally betook themselves eastwards to find a suitable home in the large cities around

[1] Suetonius, *Vita Claudii*, c. 25 : "Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit."

the Ægean. Aquila and his wife Priscilla are revealed in Acts as having taken up their quarters in Corinth; others, we may be sure, went to the leading cities of Macedonia. There would, it is true, be little welcome for them in Philippi, which, as a 'colony,' prided itself on being a 'little Rome.' Indeed Philippi may, like the mother-city, have sought to apply the edict, and it is a noteworthy fact that at this time there was apparently no regular synagogue in Philippi, but only a place of prayer by the river-side (Acts xvi. 13), and we hear nothing of native-born Jews as accepting or opposing Paul's mission-preaching. In any case, Paul as a Jew took a bold step when he entered Philippi; and we are not surprised that once he showed himself, as he did by his preaching and exorcism 'in the name of the Most High God,' a protagonist of the Jewish faith, he drew down on himself the hostility both of the mob and of the rulers.

ii. *Thessalonica*

From Philippi Paul and his companions went to Thessalonica. Here again they became the victims of popular resentment; but in this case, though the mob took their share in it, the primary instigators were Jews. If we try to trace this hostility to its source, it is not altogether explained by religious opposition to the Christian message, for Paul's doctrine of a Messiah who, following a divine necessity revealed in Scripture, had died and had risen from the dead, was not essentially different from the Christian message which the Jerusalem ecclesiastics had mildly tolerated those nineteen years since the Crucifixion. Nor is it sufficiently explained by Jewish resentment at the success attending the new gospel, notably among the non-Jewish adherents of the synagogue;

for, apart from the fact that Paul apparently did not break with the synagogue until such a rupture was plainly unavoidable, it cannot well be held that we have in such resentment a sufficient motive for the outbreak of a disturbance in which certain elements outside the synagogue eagerly took part and which finally involved for the missionaries expulsion from the city.

We do not fully explain the Jewish opposition at Thessalonica until we see that it had a political even more than a religious basis. In the end it was not essentially different from the pagan opposition at Philippi. The Jews of the synagogue had doubtless their own more personal reasons for disliking Paul and his gospel, but they also saw, or pretended to see, that acceptance of his Messianic ideas was bound to disturb the peaceable relations which they wished to be maintained between themselves and their pagan brethren, and they therefore went to extreme lengths in dissociating themselves from the new movement. They began by enlisting on their side certain street loafers (or, according to another interpretation, popular agitators); soon, as at Philippi, a crowd assembles and the town is in an uproar; the cry is raised that, in violation of the decrees of Cæsar, the missionaries are proclaiming another king, one Jesus, and it is averred against them that they are part of a movement which is creating revolutionary disturbances throughout the whole world. We miss the point of this charge if we try to explain it by reference to the previous missionary activity of Paul and his companions. The accusation of having turned the world upside down was not meant to refer merely to Paul and Silas and Timothy, but included all those adherents of Messianic Judaism who were *impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes*, and the reference to the decrees of Cæsar applies quite

definitely to the Imperial edict[1] which had enforced their expulsion from Rome. Thus the burden of the charge is this : the movement which gave rise to Messianic disturbances in Rome has now reared its insidious head in Thessalonica.

Neither Jews nor pagans were likely to inquire too carefully how far the Messianic beliefs of Paul might differ from those which had precipitated the disturbances in Rome. So far as these earlier disturbances are concerned, it is only natural to believe, in view of the ignorance which at a later time we find among the Jews of Rome with regard to the distinctive attitude of Paul (Acts xxviii. 21), that the outbursts in Rome were the expression of an apocalyptic fervour, which only in a vague way was connected with an ethical and spiritual gospel such as Paul preached. But as we see from Paul's Thessalonian Epistles, there was manifest in the Thessalonian church a not dissimilar apocalyptic fervour, which the apostle found some difficulty in regulating. It has generally been assumed, in view of the references in 1 Thess. i. 10 and v. 1 ff., that this apocalyptic outlook had been occasioned by the preaching of the apostle. But a crude and exaggerated emphasis on the apocalyptic aspect of the faith is scarcely what we should expect of Paul at a period approximately eighteen years after his conversion, and is contradicted both by the highly spiritual character of his teaching in Galatians (written, as I believe, before 1 Thessalonians) and the warning with regard to the ' restraining power ' in 2 Thessalonians. And the question therefore arises whether we have not to allow for the influence of a Messianic movement at

[1] Or edicts : there may have been more than one. Dio Cassius (lxx. 6, 6) implies that there was one in the year 41 ; but his chronology is probably at fault.

work in the Thessalonian community, perhaps previous to, and to a large extent independent of, the mission of Paul.

Be that as it may, it is not difficult to understand how, in view of the suspicion aroused by Jewish Messianic ferments, the Jewish community at Thessalonica and elsewhere should have turned violently against a movement which, as they felt, had brought their countrymen in Rome under the ban of the Imperial authority and might, if it spread, involve Jews throughout the whole empire in the loss of valued privileges. And, however little there may have been in the mission-preaching of Paul to justify, on the part of the pagan authorities, the fear of revolutionary propaganda, still the construction placed upon that preaching by the rulers of the synagogue would naturally lead magistrates, once the matter was brought before them, to treat it with some measure of severity.

iii. *Corinth*

When shortly after this Paul arrived at Corinth, he arrived as one who had learned wisdom by past failures : " I determined," he says, " not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified " (1 Cor. ii. 2). In making this declaration, Paul is not merely conscious of the failure of his philosophical apologetic at Athens ; rather he has in mind how in Macedonia his message of the Kingdom and the Messiah had lent itself to virulent and quite unnecessary misconception, and he must therefore now concentrate attention on what after all was the essential part of his gospel, namely, the redemptive work of Christ. Evidently he was able in a quite wonderful way to adhere to this policy, for when finally his Jewish brethren, finding an open rupture with

him inevitable, sought to invoke the aid of the proconsul on their side, their accusation centred not on his Messianic teaching, but on the fact that he was inculcating a form of religion which, unlike orthodox Judaism, was not in accordance with the law (Acts xviii. 13). The reference to the law here is ambiguous: it might mean that the version of Judaism preached by Paul was contrary to the law of Moses, but possibly, arising out of this, there was the cognate view that the new version was so different from the true Judaism as to lack the sanction which Judaism had, in its relations with Rome, as an officially recognised religion. Gallio, seeing clearly that the issue concerned nothing more fundamental than two rival versions of the religion of the Jews, and little disposed to show that troublesome people any more sympathy than was necessary, scouted the charge and sent both parties, accusers and accused alike, about their business. It is possible that Paul's stay at Corinth on this occasion came to an end shortly after the Gallio incident, but in any case we hear no more from Acts of Jewish accusations there against the apostle. Gallio's 'indifference' has been so often denounced from Christian pulpits that it is a pleasure to recognise how, under the providence of God, it served as a bulwark for the Christian religion at a time when Judaism was gathering strength to overwhelm it. No wonder that the apostle, who in a letter written shortly before this had poured forth his soul in bitter denunciation of that persecuting spirit of the Jews which had pursued the Church from Jerusalem to Europe and which was bringing on them the wrath of God (1 Thess. ii. 14–16), should now (shall we say after the Gallio episode?) see that the final day of crisis, when the forces of opposition would be revealed under the leadership of 'the man of lawlessness,' was

meantime staved off by the restraining power of the might and justice of Rome (2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.).

iv. *The Visit to Jerusalem*

The opposition, however, was gathering strength; and its headquarters, as Paul knew, were in Jerusalem, where in the face of a strong popular opinion the restraining power of Rome was naturally less operative. For more reasons than one Paul was disposed by this time to return to his base at Antioch and to fit in a visit to Jerusalem (an addition in Codex Bezæ to Acts xviii. 21 tells that Paul felt he must by all means be present to keep 'the feast' which was approaching—probably the Passover); and he was no doubt glad to have an opportunity to face and, if possible, conciliate Jewish opposition at its source. Accordingly, when the time came for him to leave Corinth, he sailed for Syria. Here the narrative of Acts is regrettably short, but the few facts it gives us are full of significance. We are told, *e.g.*, the apparently unimportant fact that at Cenchreæ he shaved his head, having undertaken a vow [1]—a vow which, we may assume, he was to fulfil at Jerusalem at the time of the feast. Here we have a situation to which Acts xxi. 24 provides a parallel on the occasion of Paul's later visit to Jerusalem, also at the time of a feast, viz. Pentecost. In that later instance, however, the shaving of the head perhaps takes place in Jerusalem [2]; here it is carried out on the journey, no doubt in accordance with a habit which had the sanction of personal convenience and to which

[1] The interpretation of the text which attributes the vow to Aquila rather than to Paul is as unfortunate as it is unnecessary.

[2] This is not necessarily implied in the text. Paul may have carried out this part of the vow before coming to Jerusalem, though the four men with whom he agreed to associate himself had not been able to do so.

evidence is borne by Josephus (*B.J.* II. xv. 1) that devotees were wont " for thirty days before they offered their sacrifices to abstain from wine and to shave the head." In undertaking this Nazirite vow Paul wished on his arrival in the Holy City to dedicate himself afresh to the worship and service of the God of his fathers ; and while the vow was no doubt the expression on his part of a genuinely pious desire for personal dedication in view of the arduous Gentile mission to which more insistently than ever he now found himself summoned, he would also realise that it would afford to his opponents a practical demonstration of his loyalty to the traditions of the ancestral faith.

On his way to Syria he was able to fit in a hurried visit to Ephesus, where in fulfilment of a long-cherished desire he hoped soon to embark on an active missionary crusade. Here on his one appearance in the synagogue he had a friendly reception and was given a warm invitation to remain ; but Jerusalem called him in the meantime (the urgency is no doubt to be connected with the vow and the near approach of the feast), so he left Aquila and Priscilla, promising, if God so willed, to return. What happened in Jerusalem, and during his apparently longer stay in Antioch (the original and still the main base for the Gentile mission), we are not told. It was possibly after an interval of a few months,[1] during which, on leaving Antioch, he toured right through ' the country of Galatia and Phrygia ' and made a journey through what is called ' the inland regions,' that he arrived to take up his quarters at Ephesus (Acts xix. 1).

[1] A further indication of the lapse of time is given by the notice in Acts regarding Apollos ; he was won for the fuller faith during Paul's absence, stayed some time thereafter in Ephesus, and was in residence in Corinth when Paul arrived at Ephesus.

CHAPTER III

DURING THE EPHESIAN MINISTRY

i. *Jewish Opposition*

At Ephesus Paul's earliest associations with the synagogue were marked by much cordiality. We have just seen how on his first visit to the city, as he passed eastwards from Corinth to Judæa, he had received a ready hearing from his Jewish brethren and had indeed been pressed to prolong his stay; and while unable to accede to this request he showed his interest in the work by leaving behind him Aquila and Priscilla, Jews like himself, and they would of course keep in touch with the synagogue and do their propagandist work through that channel. It was in the synagogue, too, that at this time another Jew, Apollos, found an audience for his Messianic message. When now Paul returned to Ephesus for what he meant to be a prolonged stay, he betook himself naturally to the synagogue; and it is a matter of no little interest and significance that he was able to win a hearing there for three months before unresponsiveness and hostility drove him elsewhere. Evidently he had learned now to be more conciliatory than on some previous occasions in his approach to Judaism—at Pisidian Antioch and at Thessalonica the rupture had come within two or three weeks. In a letter written shortly after this time he declared that his heart's desire and prayer for his people Israel was that they should be saved (Rom. x. 1); and he did not wish to antagonise them recklessly.

Yet there was something in the content of the apostle's message which made a breach with the synagogue inevitable. The Jews would listen responsively so long as he merely proclaimed a gospel which was a fulfilment of the hope of their fathers ; but when he proceeded to implications of this gospel which his fellow-missionaries, like Aquila and Apollos, probably did not perceive so clearly and certainly did not proclaim so emphatically as he did—urging, for example, how men's righteousness in the sight of God was determined not by their obedience to the written law but by their attitude to the living Son, and how therefore uncircumcised Gentiles might equally with Jews find a place in the family of the Father—then the patience of many was tried to the breaking-point. And their antagonism was far from ceasing merely because the heretic removed his unwelcome presence from the synagogue. One strange anecdote which Luke has preserved tells how certain Jews sought to emulate Paul's success in exorcism, with results highly discrediting to themselves ; and the attention which the new movement soon won for itself throughout the whole province of Asia and its success in winning converts among both Jews and Gentiles must inevitably have added fuel to the fire of Jewish opposition.

But however violent, on religious and national grounds, might be the opposition of Jews to the Gentile-embracing Christianity of Paul, the Roman government would secure that their opposition was kept within strictly legal limits, even though, on the one hand, it might know little about the new religion and was, on the other, not unfriendly to Judaism. Paul profited by this ' restraining power ' of Rome all the more as he generally worked in cities where the long arm of Roman law was

effective. He had already tested its value at Corinth; he was now testing it again at Ephesus.

And yet, as in the case of Jesus, so now in that of Paul, the Jews could not secure his condemnation without invoking the aid of the civil power. Sometimes the government yielded over-readily to the violence of Jewish protestations, considering Paul no doubt as a disturber of the peace. But in general Roman protection was ample, at least in the *diaspora*; naturally in Judæa it might be more accommodating to the demands of local agitation.

We know from the Gallio story how ample this protection had been at Corinth. Lack of evidence prevents our knowing how far it was sufficient at Ephesus. Arguing from the general probabilities of the case, and from what we know of the parallel case of Corinth, we may reasonably infer that the Jews of Ephesus worked up a case against the apostle, though the failure of the attempt at Corinth would have taught their leaders that there was no hope of effective civil interference unless they had quite definitely a civil as well as a religious charge to lay against their victim. Was some attempt of the kind made by the Jews at Ephesus? Or, arguing from the silence of Acts, are we to imagine that during the two years of active propaganda among (as we are told) "all the inhabitants of Asia, Jews as well as Greeks," the Jewish leaders looked quietly on and took no action?

We shall later see that Jewish opposition to the apostle at this time was by no means local and spasmodic. Having come to see that its very existence as an organised religion was threatened by the revolutionary teaching of Paul, and that this danger was not lessened but increased now that, excluded from the synagogue, the heretic

was appealing openly to the Gentiles, Judaism was organising opposition in city after city. Ephesus, we may be sure, was no exception. We have reason rather to believe that it was a very power house of opposition. When, shortly after the period now under discussion, Paul appeared in Jerusalem it was Asiatic Jews who, catching sight of him in the Temple, were ringleaders in the outbreak that led to his arrest (Acts xxi. 27). Along with this we may recall Paul's own testimony (1 Cor. xvi. 9) to the many enemies he had at Ephesus : these were on the whole more likely to be Jewish than Gentile.

But we are not left altogether to probability. (*a*) In the first place the account in Acts of the break with the synagogue indicates that Jewish opposition, though possibly limited in its range (cf. τινές, xix., 9), was violent and demonstrative. They reviled[1] the way, we are told, in the presence of the multitude. Who constituted the multitude ? The reference may, of course, be to the general body of synagogue-worshippers ; but it is noteworthy that Codex D (cf. the *Peshitto*) adds ' of the Gentiles.' It is vain to ask whether these Gentiles would be adherents of the synagogue or members of the general public ; but the general tenor of the sentence leaves us in no doubt that the unbelieving Jews set themselves to discredit the new movement and to hinder its expansion. (*b*) There are frequent references in the narrative of this period to Jewish plots against the apostle. We have Paul's own statement (in his

[1] κακολογοῦντες is a forcible term, as we see from Exod. xxi. (17) 16, quoted in Mark vii. 10. " The word is that used for the reviling of the most sacred relationships—of parents and of God. This evil-speaking was therefore equivalent to the blasphemy at Antioch and Corinth, and St. Paul felt justified in making a separation " (Rackham, *Acts*, *ad hoc*).

address to the Ephesian elders, Acts xx. 19) that during his stay at Ephesus he was assailed by plots of the Jews. These plots are not defined, but we can imagine that they were either unscrupulous attempts to work up a legal case against him, or, when that method failed, direct attacks upon his person. One such attempt was later made on his life by Jewish adversaries when the apostle was about to sail from Greece to Syria (Acts xx. 3), and on his arrival at Jerusalem we read of two attempts to assassinate him (Acts xxi. 31, xxiii. 21).

Plots of this violent nature would, however, be the work of fanatics, and we may be sure that the great body of Jewish opponents in Ephesus and elsewhere would have aimed first of all at stirring up popular enmity against the missionaries (cf. 'before the multitude,' Acts xix. 9), and if possible securing their condemnation in a court of justice, even though in this case, as in that of Jesus, they knew that their procedure would demand diplomacy and perhaps even a certain admixture of unscrupulousness.

ii. *Gentile Opposition*

Before pursuing further the question of Jewish hostility, it would be advisable to consider how, alongside of this opposition from the Jews, though, as we shall see, by no means independent of it, there was aroused active antagonism among certain sections of the Gentile population. Acts gives no hint that this opposition appeared early. We are told how in the school of Tyrannus Paul carried on his religious propaganda for two years; and not merely do the stories of Paul's works of healing and exorcism give the impression that his ministry, accompanied as it was with such obvious marks of divine favour, created much interest and en-

thusiasm, but twice in eight verses does the author definitely emphasise how widespread was the interest evoked in the new message (cf. " all the inhabitants of Asia, Jews as well as Greeks," xix. 10 ; " all the inhabitants of Ephesus, Jews as well as Greeks," ver. 17), and he ends this part of his narrative with the statement " thus did the word of the Lord increase and prevail mightily," ver. 20. Even in the story of the burning of magic formulæ there is nothing to show that that episode caused widespread resentment among the devotees of heathen cults.

Ephesus had as its tutelary deity the great Mother-Goddess whom the Greeks had come to identify with Artemis, and her temple, which surpassed in prestige and magnificence every other temple in Asia, was the centre of religious life not merely for the city but also for the whole province. Of the resident Greeks, who included in their ranks the most enlightened and progressive members of the community, many no doubt sat loosely to the established religion ; but Asiatic members of the population, led by the priesthood, were generally ready to protest their loyalty to their own Ephesian goddess, especially when the claims of conventional religion and of local patriotism were reinforced by a recognition of their own peculiar interests.

As we have said, Paul and his fellow-missionaries at Ephesus seem for long to have encountered no serious opposition from this quarter. The pagan world of those days showed an easy tolerance of new faiths, so long as these did not show themselves antagonistic to the established cult ; and it was only when, as a result perhaps of its successful missionary efforts, Christianity at Ephesus incurred the suspicion of such

antagonism that Gentile opposition to it broke out in a violent form.

The book of Acts tells the story at quite disproportionate length, though the narrative is disjointed (witness the reference to Alexander in xix. 33 without any explanatory introduction), and the wealth of picturesque detail, welcome as it is, scarcely atones for the lack of clearness and definiteness.

The trouble began in a mass meeting of craftsmen belonging to various trade guilds[1] who, addressed by a silversmith called Demetrius, were urged to believe that the spread of the Christian movement, which had no place for 'gods made with hands,' was ruinous to the trade in images and votive offerings. It was a repetition of the tale of the traffickers whom Jesus drove from the Temple. To some extent, too, we might compare it with that of the fortune-tellers of Philippi, whose appeal to the magistrates against Paul and Silas arose primarily from the loss of their source of income; only, whereas there the complaint came from certain aggrieved individuals, here it claimed to have behind it the organised forces of the trade guilds. This appeal to the pockets of the craftsmen was skilfully followed up by an appeal to civic and religious loyalty: if the movement goes on, where then, it was urged, will be the glory of our Ephesian goddess, whose temple meantime draws worshippers not merely from all Asia, but from the ends of the earth? The meeting broke up in violent disorder, and the indignation of the craftsmen spread like wild-fire among the populace. Two of Paul's travelling companions, Gaius and Aristarchus, were seized by the mob; a hurried and wholly un-

[1] The existence of such trade guilds at Ephesus is abundantly illustrated in inscriptions.

constitutional assembly of citizens gathered in the amphitheatre; and amid the prevailing confusion an outbreak of mob violence was only averted by the intervention of certain responsible authorities—firstly, the Asiarchs, who, friendly to Paul, kept him from entering into the amphitheatre, and then the secretary of the city, who, at the end of a two-hours' uproar, proceeded to calm the assembly and to secure its dismissal.

iii. *Special Problems*

Of the many problems occasioned by this narrative of the riot I would specially mention three for the bearing they have on our present inquiry, viz. (1) the attitude of the officials; (2) the attitude of the Jews; and (3) the declaration of the municipal secretary that the missionaries were neither temple robbers nor blasphemers of the goddess (ver. 37).

(1) *The attitude of the officials*—(*a*) the Asiarchs and (*b*) the municipal secretary.

(*a*) We are told in ver. 31 that some of the Asiarchs, being friendly to Paul, sent to dissuade him from venturing into the theatre. This friendliness on their part is significant. While much with regard to the character and functions of the Asiarchs is obscure, it is clear that the name was applied to certain representative citizens who at various centres throughout the province were charged by the Roman government with administrative duties in connection with religious worship. At Ephesus itself there would be at least one such official, and as the number of temples dedicated to the Roman Emperor increased, so too would the number of Asiarchs. The Asiarchs came especially into prominence on the occasion of the great religious festivals, when they were

responsible for the conduct, and to a large extent also for the expense, of the games ; and the fact that reference is here made, and that in the plural, to such officials suggests that on the present occasion something was happening at Ephesus which not merely brought a number of them together to the city, but also lent to their action in this matter a special significance. Was the occasion perhaps the great festival of the goddess, the *Artemisia*, held usually in March–April ? If it was, we may note, incidentally, that we thus acquire a chronological datum which may have considerable importance for our inquiry ; and an added significance would attach to the outbreak of religious fanaticism if it occurred at a time when crowds of pilgrims would be present from all parts of the province and the silversmiths might normally expect to do a good trade in the sale of miniature shrines. Be that as it may, we are not to think of the Asiarchs as in any special sense devotees of Artemis (had they been so, their intervention on Paul's behalf would have been harder to explain), or to imagine that their consideration for the apostle's safety necessarily betokened any sympathy with his religious views. Neither need we argue from their quasi-official position in relation to Rome that their action reflected the attitude of government circles to the new religion. Their friendly intervention arose partly from the fact that, as men of a certain social position and breadth of outlook, they were able to look down from a superior height on this outburst of superstition, bigotry, and self-interest, partly from their sense of responsibility which urged them as religious officials (and on the occasion, shall we add, of a religious festival ?) to do what was in their power to restrain so dangerous an outburst of religious fury.

(*b*) The same sense of responsibility, greater, however, in his case, lay behind the action of the municipal secretary. He was, says Sir W. M. Ramsay,[1] "perhaps the most influential individual in the city," who, besides preparing the business for the Ecclesia (the Assembly of citizens, which theoretically was the highest municipal authority), "acted as a channel of communication between the Roman provincial administration and the municipality." If the Assembly cared to express its will with vehemence and determination, the Roman proconsul, however much he might seek to impose restraints, would not care recklessly to flout its authority. Here then, as the secretary knew, was a situation which required careful handling. His speech, as has often been pointed out, was a model of tact. Seeking first by some high-sounding words on the unchallengeable greatness of the Ephesian goddess to calm the angry passions of the mob and to dissipate their fears, he went on to state that the men against whom they were clamouring were certainly not guilty of the charges urged against them,[2] and hence there was considerable danger, in view of the quite unconstitutional character of the present gathering, that the Imperial authorities would take a grave view of the day's proceedings and charge the ringleaders with rioting. If they had any real grievance they would require first of all to formulate it in a regular meeting of the Assembly and then leave it to be dealt with in the law-courts or by the proconsular authorities. Thus the attitude of the municipal secretary is that of a responsible official who, without necessarily being attracted in the least by the new religious movement, knew enough of its character to recognise the baseless-

[1] Article on 'Ephesus' in Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible.*

[2] On these charges (ver. 37), see pp. 38 ff.

ness of the charges brought against it by its enemies, and who, with a deep understanding of the mentality of the mob and the motives of its ringleaders, had no desire to allow an outburst of popular fury to create trouble for the administrative authorities.

(2) *The attitude of the Jews during the riot.*—From ver. 33 we see that a number of Jews were present in the crowd and that they put forward one Alexander to speak for them. We have already remarked on the fact that, though this is the first mention of Alexander in the narrative, he is introduced as if his name alone were sufficient without any description of his character and general attitude ; and to add to the obscurity of the passage some doubt attaches to the correct rendering of the Greek word *συνεβίβασαν* in ver 33.[1] But the general drift of the passage is clear. In ver. 32 a description is given of the hopeless confusion that prevailed, most of the crowd having no idea what the cause of the trouble was ; and, coming as it does immediately after this, ver. 33 evidently indicates an attempt on the part of the Jews, with Alexander as their mouthpiece, to clear the issue. The attempt fails ; to the mob, whose thoughts are now of nothing but the glory of their city and their goddess, it is sufficient that Alexander is a Jew, a representative of an alien race and an alien religion, and they shout him down. But what was it that induced the Jews to interfere in the matter at all ? Did their action denote friendliness to Paul, or the reverse ?

To answer these questions let us consider generally

[1] The obvious meaning would be that they 'instructed' him, *i.e.* in the line of argument he was to adopt, as if there had been some prearranged plan behind his appearance. But this is scarcely compatible with the next sentence, which says they refused to hear him. Moffatt translates "some of the mob concluded it must be Alexander."

the attitude of the Gentiles to their Jewish fellow-citizens. Josephus (*Antiq.*, XVI. vi. 1) tells us how far from popular the Jews of Asia were with the native population. Naturally in a city such as Ephesus, dominated by the worship of a heathen goddess, the refusal to recognise as gods the work of men's hands (which Demetrius took as his first shaft in his attack upon Paul) must, quite independently of the Christian movement, have exposed the Jews to persistent misunderstanding and hostility. In general, however, Judaism had its rights protected by the Imperial government (cf. Josephus, *ad. loc.*), and in its missionary work among Gentiles it would be less likely than Christianity to excite heathen opposition, being less aggressive and provocative in its propaganda and less successful in its results. Tolerant therefore of Judaism, though never friendly toward it, the Ephesian mob required some added incitement, like that supplied by the obvious success of the new movement in winning converts and by Demetrius's arguments regarding the ruin of their trade and the lowering of their goddess's prestige, before they gave way to reckless intolerance such as that described in Acts.

Once they did so give way, however, the Ephesian populace were not likely to trouble much about any nice distinctions the Jews might draw between the old-established Judaism of the synagogue and the new variety that was preached by Paul. This the Jews of Ephesus recognised to the full; and so, when in the heat and confusion of the riot they pushed forward Alexander to speak, we may be sure, in view of their general attitude to the apostle at this time, that their action betokened, not a readiness to side with him against the attacks of an infuriated paganism, but an

eager desire to dissociate themselves from him as fully as possible. What we have seen of similar disturbances may indeed justify us in going further still and suggesting that they were, if not the primary instigators of the trouble among the non-Jewish population, at least willing aiders and abettors in it.

(3) '*Neither temple robbers nor blasphemers.*'—Lastly we come to deal with that obscure but significant phrase in xix. 37—"these men who are guilty neither of temple robbery nor of blasphemy against our goddess." We shall not stay long over the charge of blasphemy: devotees of the goddess could easily persuade themselves that her name was being blasphemed by a religious movement which asserted that the gods of the nations were no gods at all. The charge is quite easily understood as a pagan reaction against Christian missionary preaching; and we need not inquire whether or not it may in some measure have been fostered by some of the Jews, who were eager to contrast their own peace-loving and tolerant attitude to paganism with the aggressive and denunciatory behaviour of the Christians.

We are on more difficult ground when we come to the question of temple robbery.[1] Whose temple can the missionaries have been thought of as robbing?—that of Artemis, or the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem? In other words, is the charge one originally raised by the pagans or by the Jews? Or (to take up a possibility

[1] To illustrate the phrase here appeal is sometimes made to Rom. ii. 22, where Paul asks the Jew whether, while avowing a detestation of idols, he does not himself rob temples (or, perhaps more probably, rob the Temple, *i.e.* at Jerusalem). A detailed examination of the passage in Romans is not called for here, nor is it certain that the meaning attached to temple robbery there should govern the interpretation of the phrase in the passage now under discussion.

which ought not to be lost sight of) may the charge have been originally raised by the Jews in one sense, and taken up by the pagans either in the same sense or in another ?

The charge has generally been interpreted, like that of blasphemy, with reference to the Ephesian goddess. Sir W. M. Ramsay, not too convincingly, interprets it generally of 'sacrilege.' "After the word ἀσέβεια had been appropriated to translate the Roman legal term *læsa majestas* 'treason,' ἱεροσυλία was the natural rendering for the Latin *sacrilegium*; and here for emphasis the speaker uses the double term οὔτε ἱεροσύλους οὔτε βλασφημοῦντας τὴν θεάν, which implies 'guilty neither in act nor in language of disrespect to the established religion of our city." (*Hastings' D.B.*, i. 441). While the blasphemy of the missionaries was primarily a religious offence, their sacrilege was something with which the proconsul might be called upon to deal. But on this explanation, whatever element of truth it may possess, it is still hard for us to understand what the missionaries can have done to give reasonable ground for such an accusation.

We turn, therefore, to explore the other possibility, viz. that the charge was one primarily instigated by the Jews. The Jews of the Dispersion, we know, were in the habit of sending substantial contributions regularly to Jerusalem for the upkeep of the Temple. When Josephus (*Antiq.*, XIV. vii.) comes to describe how Crassus, passing through Judæa on his expedition against the Parthians, carried off 2,000 talents together with a beam of solid gold from the Temple at Jerusalem, he goes on to say: "Let no one wonder that there was so much wealth in our Temple, since all the Jews throughout the habitable earth, and those that worshipped God,

nay, even those of Asia and Europe, sent their contributions to it, and this from very ancient times." In support of this he quotes a statement of Strabo, that at the time of Mithridates there had been deposited at Cos by the Jews (obviously Jews of Asia) as much as 800 talents, a sum which, designated for the Temple at Jerusalem, we may probably take as representing the contributions of a whole province for a number of years. Owing to the distresses of the time the difficulty of collecting and transmitting these contributions to Jerusalem must have been considerable; and, apart from the danger of robbers, such vast sums evoked the cupidity of native rulers and provincial governors. Thus Strabo, in the passage quoted above, informs us further that the 800 talents deposited at Cos were seized by Mithridates; and Flaccus too, whom Cicero defended on the charge of extortion, appropriated all the vast sums collected and stored at various centres in the province of Asia—at Apamea, Laodicea, Adramyttium, and Pergamum. But so effectively did organised Judaism protest against this habit of wholesale sacrilege that by the time of Augustus it was officially recognised that all the contributions of the Jews to the Temple treasury were to be regarded as sacred, and sent without let or hindrance to Jerusalem.

Apropos of the ill-treatment suffered in this matter by the Jews of Asia and North Africa, Josephus (*Antiq.*, XVI. vi.) quotes a number of Imperial Decrees guaranteeing the inviolability of these Temple contributions[1]; and two of these decrees are so relevant to our present inquiry that we reproduce them here in full. The first is an edict of Agrippa: "Agrippa, to the magistrates, senate, and people of the Ephesians, sendeth greeting.

[1] See also Philo, *Legat. ad Gaium*, 315.

I will that the care and custody of the sacred money that is carried to the temple at Jerusalem be left to the Jews of Asia, to do with it according to their ancient customs; and that such as steal that sacred money of the Jews, and fly to a sanctuary, shall be taken thence and delivered to the Jews by the same law that sacrilegious persons are taken thence."

The second is of later date, confirming the previous edicts of Augustus and Agrippa. It is, we are told, from Julius Antonius,[1] the proconsul. "To the magistrates, senate, and people of the Ephesians, greeting. As I was dispensing justice at Ephesus, on the Ides of February, the Jews that dwell in Asia demonstrated to me that Augustus and Agrippa had permitted them to use their own laws and customs, and to offer those their firstfruits, which every one of them freely offered to the Deity on account of piety, and to carry them in a company together to Jerusalem without disturbance. They also petitioned me, that I would confirm what had been granted by Augustus and Agrippa by my own sanction. I would therefore have you take notice, that according to the will of Augustus and Agrippa, I permit them to use and do according to the customs of their forefathers without disturbance." (The translation is Whiston's.)

From the above it is plain that the Jews of Asia exercised great scrupulousness with regard to their contributions to the Temple at Jerusalem, and apparently Ephesus was the centre to which, now that safe transmission was guaranteed, the contributions of the whole

[1] The names Julius and Antonius form an impossible combination, and Jullus is established by inscriptions. The proconsul in question is probably to be identified with Jullus Antonius, second son of the triumvir Marcus Antonius by Fulvia. He was consul in the year 10 B.C.

province of Asia were gathered, and from which they were dispatched by envoys to the Holy City. Evidently, too, the cry of Temple robbery was one which the Jews of Asia had had of late frequent occasion to raise. Normally it would be raised against Gentiles, who, if they wished protection, would flee to the temple of Artemis. Now the cry had been raised again—this time, however, against fellow-Jews, members of the hated sect of the Christians.

To understand how the Christian missionaries could possibly have come to be regarded by the Jews of Ephesus as Temple robbers, we may recall how at this time (cf. 1 Cor. xvi., which was written from Ephesus towards the end of the apostle's stay there), the thoughts of Paul were greatly occupied with a scheme for raising in his various Christian congregations a relief fund for the benefit of the Christians in Judæa. We shall deal with this scheme more fully in a later chapter : here we may note that its successful prosecution may well have evoked criticism and opposition, notably from the Jews, but perhaps also in some measure from the Gentiles.

Every adult Jew and Jewish proselyte was expected to make an annual contribution to the Temple in Jerusalem. It is plain that the Gentile who became directly a convert to Christianity was not likely to see any necessity for contributing to the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem ; and Paul, with his high conception of Christian freedom, was not likely to enforce that obligation on him any more than he enforced on the Gentile the keeping of the Mosaic law. Hence the remarkable successes which Christianity seems after a time to have had among the Gentile population of Ephesus and Asia must have brought home to the Jews that large numbers of potential proselytes were becoming adherents of a version of the Jewish faith

which carried with it no loyalty to the Jewish Temple and no obligation to contribute to its support. Thus in so far as he refused to impose the Temple tax on his Gentile converts, to that extent Paul might well appear to a jealous and malevolent Judaism to be robbing the Temple of its due.

But more significant is what happened with regard to the Jew, or Jewish proselyte, who became a Christian. So far as Paul was concerned, we can scarcely believe that he showed himself opposed to the payment by Jewish Christians of the Temple tax any more than he did to their keeping of the Mosaic Law. But as with the Law, so with the Temple, his teaching, while not condemnatory of the old ways, raised men to higher levels of vision where they saw the old ways in a new perspective. God's final dwelling-place on earth could not be a temple made with hands. Since the coming of the Son of God, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, the truth of which the temple on Mount Zion was an anticipation and a symbol had now received its fulfilment and become a reality: God had now taken up His dwelling in the midst of His redeemed people. The Christian Fellowship therefore was the real Temple of God. This, as we may see from the epistles of this period, was one of the great messages which Paul by this time had come to proclaim[1]; and as he saw new additions to the Fellowship in city after city of Macedonia, Achaia, and Asia, it was as if before his eyes the new and holier Temple of the Lord was gradually taking shape (Eph. ii. 20–22). Such teaching,

[1] See pp. 120 ff. This teaching occurs especially in the Epistle to the Ephesians, and this fact may be taken as corroborating the view that that epistle belongs to the Ephesian rather than to the Roman period; but we have it also in the Corinthian epistles, *e.g.* 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16.

with its reminder that the Temple on Mount Zion was at best a symbol of the more spiritual Temple that was now coming into being, was bound, whether Paul drew this further lesson or not, to change the whole attitude of Christian Jews to the question of the upkeep of the Jerusalem Temple ; and especially when Paul, taking his cue from the compulsory Temple tax of the Jews, began to solicit from the members of the Christian churches a voluntary contribution [1] for the support of ' the Christian Temple,' as he did when he sought to raise a collection for the benefit of ' the saints ' in Judæa, we can imagine that contributions from Jewish Christians to the Temple in Jerusalem were bound to show a diminution ; and therefore it would not be surprising if the Jews of Asia, in their readiness to believe any evil of the heretic and their eagerness to adopt any measure to suppress him, took up and spread the cry that he was robbing their Temple.

The language of the municipal secretary at Ephesus in summarily dismissing the accusation would seem to imply that we have here to deal with the revival, at the time of the riot, of an accusation which had been raised on a previous occasion and had then been discredited. We shall later (p. 142) see reason to believe that previous to the outburst of Gentile fanaticism under Demetrius the silversmith there had been a violent outbreak of Jewish hostility which had brought the apostle to prison and indeed nearly to death. Shall we take it, then, that the Jews of Ephesus, foiled as those of Corinth had been in their attempts to get the Imperial authorities to take a sinister view of the Christian movement, had at an earlier stage of the Ephesian ministry brought against

[1] He may also have invited them to contribute towards aggressive missionary work in the outlying parts of the province or elsewhere.

Paul and his companions the serious charge of temple robbery, a charge which, in view of the Imperial Edicts addressed to the magistrates, senate, and people of Ephesus, the proconsul could not possibly ignore? The charge would not bear examination and would seem in the end to have been dismissed. But now that Gentile opposition had burst out with a fury which, it was no doubt hoped, would compel the authorities to take action, the Jews as they mingled with the riotous mob sought to raise once more the cry that the Christians were Temple robbers. It may even have been the case that by dwelling on the extent to which the new religion was winning Gentile converts they succeeded also in spreading the insinuation that the temple of Artemis too was being robbed. There is no reflection, however, of such a thought in the speech of Demetrius.

In this chapter we have sought to make it plain that the hostility to Paul at Ephesus was mainly organised by Jews, and that already Jewish opposition, notably among the Jews of Asia, was organising its forces not merely to thwart but even to overwhelm him. Well may the apostle, after his experiences in Asia, have felt confirmed in his belief that it was an over-ruling Providence which had led him at the beginning of his tour to pass by Ephesus and to go on to Europe, where, being farther from its base, Judaism was less able to exert its power against the forces of Roman law and order. Those two years spent in Europe had taught Paul much: he had learned to avoid certain dangers in the presentation of his message, and he had learned better to estimate the character of the forces arrayed against him. The gospel had moreover been firmly established in various new centres, and the tolerance extended to it at Corinth by so illus-

rious a governor as Gallio did much to save Rome from taking, at this stage, too sinister a view of the new movement. If after his first preliminary tour in Galatia Paul had embarked on the troubled seas of Asia, it is probable that the gospel would at once have been involved in storms which, humanly speaking, would have seriously threatened its survival.

CHAPTER IV

AFTER THE EPHESIAN MINISTRY

i. *In Macedonia and Achaia*

SOME light on the Ephesian ministry may be looked for from the events of the period which immediately succeeded. After leaving Ephesus Paul visited Macedonia and Corinth, and in Part III of our present study we shall attempt to trace in some detail his movements on that journey. It was for the apostle a time of strain from which there was no relief. What he says of one particular period in it was true indeed of the whole: "we were troubled on every side; without were fightings, within were fears" (2 Cor. vii. 5). The care of all the churches was like an onslaught that renewed itself day after day (2 Cor. xi. 28). Enemies were at work in his various churches, sowing tares in his wheat. It is a period which Acts, however, dismisses in a couple of prosaic sentences: "And after the uproar was ceased, Paul called unto him the disciples, and embraced them, and departed for to go into Macedonia. And when he had gone over those parts and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece and there abode three months" (Acts xx. 1–3)—a summary account which may recall to some modern readers how in war-time the long hours of a terrific bombardment were described in the official *communiqué* as 'a certain liveliness in the X.Y. area.'

At this point, however, Acts does introduce one detail which for our purpose is full of significance. It tells

(xx. 3) how at the end of his three months' stay at Corinth, when the apostle was about to sail for Syria, the Jews laid a plot against him, so that instead of taking the more direct sea-route he returned via Macedonia. Thus there were those among the Jews who were quite prepared to take the renegade (as they regarded him) and to do him to death. That it was so a few weeks later at Jerusalem is shown by the statements in Acts xxi. 31 and xxiii. 12 f.; but it is interesting to know that this was the attitude meantime of some of the Jews of the Dispersion. That such a thing was possible at Corinth is not without relation to the question of the previous opposition to the apostle at Ephesus—especially as by this time Jewish opposition was becoming a unified force, and Ephesus was one of its main centres. What we know from other sources of the Jews of Ephesus might even prepare us to believe that they may have been behind the Corinthian plot.

All this time Paul was giving much thought to the organisation in his Gentile churches of a collection on behalf of the poor Christians of Judæa, and the names mentioned in Acts xx. 4 are probably those of official delegates appointed to assist him in this work.

ii. *Address to the Ephesian Elders*

After Corinth there was a hurried visit to Philippi and to Troas. There was no time to go to Ephesus, the scene of so many triumphs and so many trials, but Paul summoned the elders of the church to meet him at Miletus; and there is every reason to accept the address given in Acts xx. 18 ff. as a trustworthy *résumé* of what he had to say to them.

At the outset the apostle recalls his general attitude

during those years of 'tears and trials' that he had spent among them, and in particular he refers to the plots he had suffered at the hands of the Jews—a significant statement, especially as Acts in the narrative of the Ephesian ministry has nothing to say directly of such plots. "And now," he adds, "behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me." It was indeed with Paul as it had been with his Master: he was "on the way going up to Jerusalem," and he wished to warn his followers of the things he saw he "must suffer." "I know," he went on, "that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more." We need not press these words into the service of any theory regarding the possibility of a visit to Ephesus subsequent to the Roman imprisonment. They are to be taken rather for what they claim to be, a faithful record of Paul's outlook at the time, testifying to his recognition of the developing dangers which might indeed lead to his destruction, and to his determination that if his life were spared he would seek some means of getting to Rome and, if the way should open up, of inaugurating there a new stage in the missionary crusade, by which his work should be transferred from the East to the West. In the remainder of the address he dwells largely on the gospel which he had proclaimed in all its fullness and on the Church which Christ had purchased with His blood, and which, as he sees, is likely soon to be the prey of many enemies and false friends. Lastly, there are certain references to his own conduct at Ephesus which for our purpose will repay attention.

(*a*) In ver. 26 Paul asserts that he has no man's blood

on his head. This does not imply that he had perhaps been accused of murder. The protestation is linked up with an avowal, in the next verse, that he had never shrunk from proclaiming the whole counsel of God, so that without doubt we have here a reminiscence of Ezekiel's parable of the watchman (iii. 16–21, xxxiii. 1–9), who at a time of crisis is held blameless or responsible according as he gives or omits to give warning.

(*b*) It is different, however, with what comes later in ver. 33. "I have coveted no man's silver, or gold, or apparel." Clearly there is here reflected a charge which had been made against the apostle and which he repudiates. It recalls to us the probability that at Ephesus he had been accused of temple robbery (pp. 38 ff.). But it prepares us also to consider, as we shall have occasion to do later (p. 263), whether another charge levelled against the apostle was not that of appropriating money and goods for his own personal ends.

(*c*) In answering this charge of 'covetousness' the apostle appeals to the fact that he had supported himself and his colleagues by the work of his hands (ver. 34). In other words, so far from making a profit out of his ministry, he had not even accepted from the Ephesians a maintenance allowance. His attitude in this matter was, he claims, an illustration in practical life of the Christian duty which the strong have towards the needy. Fuller light on the meaning of this claim will be forthcoming as our inquiry proceeds, when we shall see that, while eager to receive contributions from his various churches, he took care that these were devoted to one or other of two great schemes to which, like the missionary statesman that he was, he was giving at this time much

earnest attention, viz. (1) the expansion of the gospel, so that in any one province not merely the capital city but the outlying towns and the country districts should be evangelised, and that the work should be extended to ever new fields—and for such work money was as necessary then as now; and (2) the relief-fund which he was raising in the various Gentile churches for the benefit of the struggling churches of Judæa—the so-called 'collection for the saints.'

iii. *Jerusalem*

After an affecting parting from the Ephesian elders Paul and his little company crossed by sea to Tyre; and both there and later at Cæsarea they were met with prognostications of coming doom. In Syria and in Judæa the Christian brethren had only too good reason to fear the fate that awaited the apostle at Jerusalem. They beseech him not to go; but Paul, like Jesus, knows that he *must*, and he declares his readiness to face not imprisonment merely, but death too for the sake of the Lord Jesus (Acts xxi. 13).

Having arrived at the Holy City, Paul went the following morning to interview James, the head of the Jerusalem Church, and at this meeting all the elders were present. At once the talk turned on what was the critical issue. On the one hand Paul related the wonderful triumphs of the gospel among the Gentiles; on the other the Jewish-Christian leaders, while praising God for the news, set over against it the grave disquietude which the new movement was creating among many thousands of Jewish-Christians who were still loyal in their adherence to the law. Behind this disquietude, in so far at least as it had the sympathy of the Jerusalem

leaders, there was no longer any demand that Gentile-Christians should be made to accept the Jewish law—that matter, said James, had already been settled, and he quoted the terms of the Apostolic Decree (see p. 256). The difficulty was occasioned rather by fear of what might happen to the Jews of the Dispersion who should become Christian—was there not a danger that, linked up now in a fellowship which was predominantly Gentile and which had no feeling for Jewish laws and customs and no obligation to observe them, Jewish-Christians might readily abandon their old ways and gradually denationalise themselves? The fear was a quite natural one, and in this case it was augmented by the mixed forces of bigotry and misrepresentation. There were many Jews, so the Jerusalem leaders pointed out, who had come to believe that Paul in prosecuting his Gentile mission urged the Jews of the Dispersion to give over their old customs, and to cease observance of the law and the practice of circumcision. It was a charge which was quite untrue; for, while Paul refused to limit by any purely Jewish restrictions the liberty of Gentile-Christians, he himself remained a loyal Jew, and we cannot believe that in any direct way he perverted the loyalty of others. This James and his colleagues knew, and so they proposed to Paul that, to demonstrate his own strict adherence to Jewish custom and to disarm his opponents, he should not merely carry out for himself a Nazirite vow (as it was perhaps his intention to do before he came to the feast; it would be part of the ritual of dedicating the collection), but should also, in view of the rather costly offerings involved in the vow (Num. vi. 13 ff.), identify himself (by meeting their expenses, etc.) with four Jewish brethren, obviously poor men, who wished to take on themselves the same

obligation. To this proposal Paul readily assented: next day he publicly associated himself with the four men in question and made arrangements for the sacrifices of each of the company.

So much for Paul's attitude to the Law, and the way it was misunderstood and misrepresented. His action with regard to the Nazirite vow served next to bring to the front the question of his attitude to the Temple. In performance of the vow, and in offering the 'alms' he had brought from his Gentile churches (Acts xxiv. 17, 18), he would appear frequently in the Temple, carrying out various offices on behalf of himself and his four obscure associates; and seeing him there (no doubt in company with one of the others) some Asiatic Jews, who, after his long residence in Ephesus, would know him better than most of the Jerusalemites would do, suddenly raised an uproar and laid hands on him, shouting, "Here is the fellow who wherever he goes spreads teaching against God's People and the Law and the Temple, and he has actually brought Gentiles into the Temple and defiled this Holy Place." The narrator goes on to say that they had previously seen him in the city with Trophimus, a Gentile-Christian who was a collection-delegate from the churches of Asia (Acts xx. 4); and, knowing his connection with the collection and confusing him perhaps with one of Paul's Nazirite companions, they had erroneously imagined that the apostle had taken Trophimus into the Temple.

To understand the situation we may recall that, while Gentiles were welcomed freely into one of the outer courts of the Temple, that court was surrounded by a barrier-wall which by a series of stone-inscriptions warned Gentiles that they must not on pain of death go further. Paul had that barrier-wall in mind when in

Ephesians (written, as I believe, during the period of the Ephesian ministry) he had declared how in Christ Gentile and Jew had been made one, the dividing wall between them having been broken down (Eph. ii. 14). But while deeply and proudly conscious that in a spiritual sense the old division had gone, and that, more glorious than the Temple on Mount Zion, there was now arising a spiritual Temple in whose fabric Jews and Gentiles were welded together into a sacred unity, Paul was nevertheless too staunchly and sensitively loyal to break his nation's laws and to wound the susceptibilities of his brethren by wantonly introducing a Gentile into a forbidden part of the Temple. The episode, however, is sufficient to remind us how miserably the apostle's attitude to the Temple (as to the Law) was misrepresented and turned to evil account by those who were determined to accomplish his ruin. Once the cry was raised, Paul was immediately seized by the mob, and dragged outside the Temple ; an attempt was even made, we are told, to kill him (Acts xxi. 31) ; in the middle of the uproar there appeared a detachment of the garrison troops, and Paul was taken into custody. Thus began the long imprisonment that took him finally to Rome.

It is instructive to note the charges which in the subsequent proceedings were brought against him. He was said to be a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes, who went about the world stirring up sedition everywhere among the Jews, and who on returning to Jerusalem had actually desecrated the Temple (Acts xxiv. 5, 6). His accusers too were able to represent that they had behind them the whole body of the Jews both at Jerusalem and at Cæsarea (xxv. 24) ; and the cry was loudly raised : "Away with him ; such a fellow is not fit to live" (xxii. 22). Paul's judges, however, were not greatly

impressed by the accusations (xxiii. 29 ; xxv. 18 f.), and more than one of them expressed the view that so far from his being guilty of a capital charge it was doubtful whether he even deserved imprisonment ; and but for his appeal to Cæsar he might probably have been set at liberty.

Part 2

THE HYPOTHESIS OF AN EPHESIAN IMPRISONMENT

CHAPTER V

HISTORY OF CRITICAL OPINION

THE hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment is not altogether a recent one. Unwilling to date Philippians as late as a Roman imprisonment, Origen assigned it to the period between 1 and 2 Corinthians; and G. L. Oeder in his *Observatio Exegetico-Critica de Tempore et Loco Scriptarum Epistolarum B. Pauli Apost. ad Philippenses et Corinthios*, Leipzig, 1731, arguing on quite fantastic grounds that Philippians is earlier than 1 Corinthians, maintained that at the time of writing Philippians Paul was the victim of a summary arrest in some provincial town.

But the modern statement of the case begins with H. Lisco, of Berlin, who in his *Vincula Sanctorum*, 1900 (as also in his *Roma Peregrina*, 1901) developed the thesis that all of the Imprisonment Epistles (in the order Colossians and Philemon; Ephesians; Philippians) and also (previous to Philippians) the Second Epistle to Timothy originated in an Ephesian imprisonment.

Linking up Paul's words in 1 Cor. xv. 32, where he speaks of fighting with beasts at Ephesus, with the tradition regarding a tower at Ephesus which is still pointed out as Paul's prison, Lisco, in the earlier and by far the more important of his two books, expounded the thesis that owing to his activity in prosecuting his 'collection for the saints' the apostle was accused before the proconsul of temple robbery, was condemned to the lions, and experienced a marvellous deliverance.

In this reconstruction viewed as a whole there is much which appears to be on right lines, and as one who has found Lisco's ideas at times singularly suggestive the present writer cannot but express regret that his book was received with such scant respect. Subsequent criticism tended to miss the wheat among the chaff. It must be admitted, however, that Lisco spoils his case in the process of development. He shows in details a tendency to fancifulness and exaggeration which ends by obscuring the truth which he seeks to reveal, and his reliance on deductions from purely literary parallels leads him too often into positions which historically are quite untenable.[1] Thus in the Epistle to the Philippians he traces various hidden allusions to the collection-scheme, whereas, as a matter of fact (and this is one of the historical problems of that epistle), Philippians contains no reference to the collection at all. Obsessed by the thought of the θηριομαχία referred to in 1 Cor. xv. 32, he is willing to believe (even though this involves for him the difficult assumption that the verse in 1 Corinthians is misplaced and belongs to a date later than the rest of the letter) that Paul has that terrible episode in mind when in 2 Cor. i. 8 he alludes to the 'distress' in Asia which had brought him to the verge of death; and further, after painting a glowing picture of the θηριομαχία by the aid of images derived from later stories of such encounters, he goes on to read the whole of 2 Cor. i.–vi. as if it were shot through and through with reminiscences of the amphitheatre—tracing, *e.g.*, references in the ὀσμή and εὐωδία of ii. 14 f. to the perfume which filled the theatre, in the

[1] This tendency to fancifulness is carried to a ridiculous length in his second book, where, arguing on quite insufficient grounds that Rome was the name given to the part of Ephesus in which Paul's prison lay, he takes most of the references in early Christian literature and interprets these in terms of the Ephesian Rome!

γυμνός and ἐκδύεσθαι of v. 3 f. to the victim stripped to meet the lion, in the πλάκες of iii. 3 to the tablets on which the spectators voted for or against a verdict of mercy, and so on. By arguments such as these the best case would be ruled out of court.

Apart from these and similar extravagances Lisco's thesis fails by being at once too simple and too complicated. In his historical outlook he concentrates attention too exclusively on the θηριομαχία and the collection, and so finds practically the same situation behind all the Imprisonment Epistles (not to mention parts of 2 Timothy), all of which he groups together within the space of a few weeks. On the other hand, in his effort to solve the difficulties occasioned by the Corinthian Epistle he divides 2 Corinthians into a mass of small fragments, which by a process of regrouping he assigns to three letters of different dates. There is no hope of a reconstruction along such lines. Lisco has indeed opened for us an interesting critical gateway, but while giving him all credit for this we cannot follow him on the path he takes beyond. We may accept the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment, but every subsequent advance must be made by a slow and careful process of scientific inquiry. To begin with, the various problems must be carefully delimited, and examined one by one. Light must be sought from every quarter on the general conditions at Ephesus during the apostle's ministry there; and a fresh study must be undertaken of the situation behind each of the epistles which are regarded as belonging to this period. Since Lisco's work appeared much progress has been made along all these lines.

In this connection no name deserves more honoured mention than that of Professor Adolf Deissmann, of Berlin. Even before the publication of Lisco's work he

had been interested in the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment, having, he tells us (*Light from the Ancient East*, 2nd English edition, p. 237), " introduced it when lecturing at the Theological Seminary at Herborn in 1897, with application to Colossians, Philemon, and Ephesians." Since then the knowledge that he was sympathetic to the hypothesis has done much to save it from the neglect with which so many other scholars have sought to treat it, and while himself making no lengthy contribution to the subject he has in numerous ways continued since the first to lend his weighty support to the work of further investigation. In his book on *Paul* (2nd English edition, p. 17) he gives a very full bibliography dealing with the question ; he has also devoted much time and attention to excavations in Ephesus ; and in the volume of *Anatolian Studies* (*presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay*, Manchester, 1923) there is an especially illuminating contribution from his pen, dealing in particular with the Ephesian origin of Philippians.

As an example of the advantage gained by a careful delimitation of the problem, we may mention how the case for assigning Philippians to Ephesus was immensely strengthened by two special studies, one by M. Albertz in his article ' Über die Abfassung des Philipperbriefs des Paulus in Ephesus ' in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1910, the other by P. Feine in his book *Die Abfassung des Philipperbriefes in Ephesus* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1916). More recently W. Michaelis,[1] a junior colleague of Professor Deissmann at Berlin, has sought in his monograph *Die Gefangenschaft des Paulus in Ephesus* (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1925), based largely on a study of the movements

[1] Michaelis has contributed an article on ' The Trial of St. Paul at Ephesus ' to the *Journal of Theological Studies*, July 1928.

of Timothy and other companions of Paul, to establish a case for an Ephesian origin of the Imprisonment Epistles, and to supply a new version of the chronology of that period. This book is a singularly acute and suggestive study, but is at times far from convincing; and it is unfortunate that he should have complicated his thesis by an attempt to assign the Thessalonian Epistles (as well as Galatians) to this general period.[1] Reference ought also to be made to the sympathetic examination of the problem by H. Appel in his *Einleitung in des Neue Testament*.

Outside of Germany the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment has also won adherents. One of France's foremost critics, M. Goguel, accepts it in his recent *Introduction au Nouveau Testament* (Leroux, Paris; see especially Tome iv, première partie, pp. 364 ff.). Not much systematic work on the subject has been done by English or American scholars, but contributions in various journals testify to the interest it has elicited. Reference may be made to the following articles:— B. J. Robinson: 'An Ephesian Imprisonment of Paul' (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, New York, 1910); Kirsopp Lake: 'The Critical Problems of the Epistle to the Philippians' (*Expositor*, June 1914); W. Burch: 'Was St. Paul in Prison at Ephesus?' (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1914); B. W. Bacon: 'Again the Ephesian Imprisonment of Paul' (*Expositor*, March 1915); E. W. Winstanley: 'Pauline Letters from an Ephesian Prison'

[1] He dates Galatians near the end of Paul's first visit to Corinth. After the apostle's arrival in Ephesus come Philemon, Colossians, and 2 Thessalonians, followed later by Philippians and 1 Corinthians. 1 Thessalonians and 2 Corinthians belong to the period following the departure from Ephesus, and Rom. xvi. 3 ff. was written to Ephesus from Philippi on the occasion of the apostle's last visit there (Acts xx. 6).

(*Expositor*, June 1915); Maurice Jones: 'The Epistles of the Captivity. Where were they Written?' (*Expositor*, October 1915); C. R. Bowen: 'Are Paul's Prison Letters from Ephesus?' (*American Journal of Theology*, 1920). In an article entitled 'Pauline Readjustments' (*Expositor*, June 1924) T. W. Llynfi Davies dealt with the possibility of assigning 2 Tim. iv. 9 ff. to a period following an Ephesian imprisonment, and in a book with the same title (Williams & Norgate, 1927) he has since developed his thesis in a way which is not likely to win acceptance. The most recent English commentary on Philippians, that of J. H. Michael in *The Moffatt Commentary*, accepts the Ephesian origin of that epistle. The hypothesis has also been discussed, but rejected, by Maurice Jones in his volume on Philippians in the *Westminster Commentary*. See also Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, third edition, page 622.

An hypothesis which has received the sympathetic support of such scholars as Deissmann, Feine, Goguel, and (more tentatively) Kirsopp Lake is not one to be set aside lightly. It is to be noted, however, that advocates of the theory of an Ephesian imprisonment are by no means agreed as to the implications to be based on it. Appel and Michaelis ascribe all of the Imprisonment Epistles to this period. Deissmann began by being sceptical with regard to Philippians, but his article in *Anatolian Studies* is a powerful plea that that letter too should be assigned with the others to Ephesus. There is indeed an increasing readiness on the part of scholars to date Philippians from Ephesus. But of those who do so there are several, *e.g.* Albertz, Feine, Goguel, who (largely because of the developed doctrines found in Colossians) prefer to assign Colossians and Philemon to Cæsarea or Rome. B. W. Robinson, on the other hand,

accepts Colossians and Philemon as originating in Ephesus, but is less certain with regard to Philippians (cf. his recent *Life of Christ*, Chicago, 1918).

But when we have decided, as the present writer is prepared to do, to assign all of the Imprisonment Epistles to the Ephesian period, the task still remains of reconstructing that whole period so that we shall be able to place each of the epistles in its own setting, and trace the development of events from stage to stage. Little has so far been accomplished along this line, and this is one of the problems to which we shall give special attention in the present inquiry.

CHAPTER VI

DIRECT EVIDENCE OF AN EPHESIAN IMPRISONMENT

i. *New Testament Evidence*

THAT Paul was imprisoned in Ephesus is nowhere definitely stated in the New Testament, but there are quite a number of passages which on such a hypothesis acquire an added significance, and may be taken as corroborative of it.

(1) In his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (xi. 23), written shortly after leaving Ephesus, Paul claims that as compared with his traducers he has been 'in prisons far more frequently.' But previous to the time when 2 Corinthians was written Acts records only one imprisonment, viz. at Philippi. Where, then, were the others? The claim would be more significant if some of those imprisonments were comparatively recent, and a survey of the development of opposition such as we have made in the preceding chapters suggests that there were few occasions during which hostility was more fierce and imprisonment more probable than the three years' residence in Ephesus.

(2) In a letter written during the Ephesian ministry, the First Epistle to the Corinthians (xv. 30–2), the apostle uses a still stronger statement: he refers to fighting with wild beasts at Ephesus, and speaks of his life being in danger every hour. The whole passage deserves careful and detailed study (see pp. 126 ff.). Here it may be said that an examination of the context shows how unwarranted are the attempts which have been made to empty the words

of their normal meaning, viz. that Paul had at Ephesus been confronted with the possibility (it may never have been more than a possibility) of being exposed in the arena. The same thought was no doubt at the back of his mind when in an earlier passage in the same epistle (iv. 9) he wrote, " It seems to me that God means us apostles to come in at the very end, like the doomed gladiators in the arena ! " (Moffatt's translation). The whole of that passage (1 Cor. iv. 8–13, where note especially the pregnant reference in ver. 11 to the sufferings continuing ' to this very hour ') reflects the extremities to which Paul was reduced during his ministry at Ephesus.

(3) A passage of very great interest and significance occurs at the opening of 2 Corinthians (i. 8–10) : " Now I would like you to know about the distress which befell me in Asia, brothers. I was crushed, crushed far more than I could stand, so much so that I despaired even of life ; in fact I told myself it was the sentence of death. But that was to make me rely not on myself but on the God who raises the dead ; He rescued me from so terrible a death, He rescues still, and I rely upon Him for the hope that He will continue to rescue me " (Moffatt). Here again the reference is quite definitely to something which took place, if not in Ephesus, at least in Asia. The precise character of the experience will be discussed more fully later (pp. 131 ff.). Imprisonment, it will be noted, is not specifically mentioned ; yet there is no denying the desperate character of the danger from which the apostle feels he has been supernaturally delivered. It is as if he had been brought back from the dead. Paul's sense of having been at the very gates of death expresses itself more than once in the chapters which follow : see especially iv. 8 ff. and vi. 9.

(4) In the list of salutations in Romans xvi. there are two which for our purpose are specially significant: ver. 3, "Salute Priscilla and Aquila, who risked their necks to save me," and ver. 7, "Salute Andronicus and Junias my fellow-prisoners." Though no time-indication is given, there can scarcely be any doubt that in each case Paul is thinking of a comparatively recent experience: otherwise the reference would have little point. Now Aquila and Priscilla were with the apostle in Asia (we have no news of them subsequently to that general period), and with regard to ver. 7 there is no reason to think that Paul suffered imprisonment[1] either in Macedonia or in Corinth (where he probably was when he wrote Romans). Each of these two references, therefore, the one dealing with a situation when the apostle's life was in danger, the other indicating an imprisonment, leads us naturally to think of Ephesus. And while this is true even on the traditional view that the salutations of this chapter are addressed to Rome, the argument becomes almost irresistible if, on the view that is now more generally accepted, we regard the salutations in Rom. xvi. as addressed to the church at Ephesus—in which case Aquila and Priscilla, Junias and Andronicus are still present in the city which witnessed their sufferings, and the brethren to whom Paul wrote would understand and appreciate his references.

ii. *Extra-canonical Evidence*

In support of the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment there may also be cited certain evidence drawn from sources outside of the New Testament.

[1] There can be no question that 'fellow-prisoners' is to be interpreted literally (cf. p. 149), and the reference is of course not to be limited to the sole previous imprisonment recorded in Acts, viz. at Philippi.

(1) We may note in passing the quite general remark of Clement of Rome (v. 6) that Paul was seven times in prison (ἑπτάκις δέσμα φορέσας). How far this is a mere deduction from Paul's own language in 2 Cor. xi. 23 ('in prisons more abundantly') we cannot say.

(2) There are various references to the story of Paul's encounter with a lion in the arena at Ephesus—a story which, with the analogous story regarding his disciple Thekla, the virgin martyr of Iconium, has long been assumed to have formed part of the apocryphal Acts of Paul. (*a*) A sentence in the Acts of Titus says that at Ephesus Paul 'fought with beasts, being thrown to a lion.' (*b*) Hippolytus, in the third century, has an obvious allusion to the story when, in his Commentary on Daniel (iii. 29), he asks: "if we believe that when Paul was condemned to the beasts the lion that was set upon him lay down at his feet and licked him, how shall we not believe that which happened in the case of Daniel?" (*c*) A lengthy summary of the story is preserved by the fourteenth-century historian Nicephorus Callisti[1] (*Ecclesiastical History*, ii. 25), who, after relating the story, refers to the fact that it does not occur in the canonical book of Acts, but seeks to meet the objection by recalling that 'John alone of the Evangelists has told of the raising of Lazarus.' (*d*) Thanks to an interesting discovery[2] made in 1928 by Professor Carl Schmidt, who in the last thirty years has accomplished so much for the restoration of the Coptic text of the Acts of Paul, there have now come to light certain new portions of

[1] Nicephorus's account is reproduced by M. R. James in *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 292.

[2] Professor Schmidt has announced his discovery in a recent publication of the Prussian Academy: *Neue Funde zu den alten* Πράξεις Παύλου (1929).

the Acts of Paul in Greek, and among these is the story of Paul's encounter with the lion at Ephesus.

The story tells how at Ephesus Paul used such liberty of speech that he incurred the wrath both of the populace and of the governor Hieronymus, whose wife he had converted. He was accordingly condemned to fight in the arena. But there a great lion, so far from attacking him, came and licked his feet. " Art thou the lion whom I baptised ? " Paul asked, and the lion answered " Yes." Other animals were then let loose on the apostle and orders were issued for archers to shoot the lion ; but suddenly there burst on the arena a terrible hailstorm, which killed the animals, tore off the ear of the governor, and left Paul and the lion untouched. Shortly after this miraculous escape Paul left Ephesus and sailed for Macedonia.

This story would seem to go back as far as the second century, but little or no weight need be attached to it as independent evidence. It may be little more than an apocryphal expression of Paul's own reference to ' fighting with beasts at Ephesus ' in 1 Cor. xv. 32.

(3) In Ephesus there is still shown a building which tradition declares to have been Paul's prison.

(4) Of more interest and value than any of the above is the second-century evidence of the so-called Monarchian Prologues to Paul's Epistles. In the Prologue to the Epistle to the Colossians it is asserted : ' apostulus iam ligatus scribit eis ab Epheso.' The special importance of this evidence is twofold : (*a*) behind it there lies almost certainly the testimony of Marcion ; (*b*) it definitely provides evidence for an imprisonment at Ephesus, and for the writing of Colossians during that imprisonment, and this evidence is obviously not a mere deduction from the letter itself.

Such is the sum-total of the direct evidence from the New Testament and from extra-canonical sources to support the theory of an Ephesian imprisonment. In itself it is not convincing. In the next chapter, however, we shall see how it may be supplemented by indirect evidence which is too impressive to be lightly set aside.

CHAPTER VII

EVIDENCE FOR CONNECTING THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES WITH EPHESUS

THE evidence adduced in the previous chapter for an imprisonment of Paul at Ephesus may seem slight, and if it stood alone no safe superstructure could be raised on it. It is because of the lack of any conclusive direct evidence, together with the silence of Acts, that the hypothesis has been so long neglected. But if strong corroboration were to come from another quarter, then the evidence to which we have already appealed would be recognised as carrying with it very considerable weight. Such evidence is provided by a study of the Imprisonment Epistles—Philippians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon. *The* great argument for an Ephesian imprisonment is that it provides by far the most intelligible setting for some (or, as the present writer would prefer to say, for all) of these Epistles. It is with the various aspects and implications of this argument that we shall be concerned throughout the rest of our inquiry ; here in this chapter we give a few illustrations which point towards its truth.

i. *The Flight of Onesimus*

When Philemon's slave Onesimus deserted his master in the little town of Colossæ in the Lycus valley, is it not in every way more probable that he fled to Ephesus rather than (as is commonly assumed) to Rome ? Only in the most desperate circumstances, such as the letter gives us

no reason to assume, would a fugitive from justice have undertaken over unknown and dangerous roads a journey of a thousand miles by land, together with two sea voyages extending over some five days, especially when comparatively near at hand there was a city with which he was no doubt already familiar, and which was of sufficient size to afford him all the security that he was likely to require.

Note.—There is much, it is to be observed, in Onesimus's relations with Paul which is wrapped for us in considerable mystery.

Are we to imagine (*a*) that, having been himself arrested, the runaway slave found himself flung into the same prison as the apostle, to whom till then he was a stranger? Such a coincidence is highly improbable, and if we are to regard it as happening in Rome we may note further how very radically Paul's condition of imprisonment must have changed for the worse if, following on two years spent in his own hired house (Acts xxviii. 30), he was reduced to sharing the same prison-cell as a fugitive slave.

Or (*b*) had Onesimus some previous relations with the apostle? On our reconstruction Paul had not yet visited Colossæ, but Onesimus may with his master have met Paul at Ephesus. If the language of Philem. 19 ('you owe to me your very soul') be taken to imply that Philemon had come personally under the apostle's influence, this on our reconstruction would point to Ephesus, and Onesimus might then have been with his master. It is difficult, however, to imagine any circumstances in which Onesimus, a fugitive from justice, would have decided of his own accord to visit another prisoner in his cell, especially a prisoner who excited so much public interest as Paul.

(*c*) Perhaps therefore we may conjecture that, previous to his interview with the apostle, he had met (whether by accident or design) some Christian friend who had known him in other days—Epaphras, for example, who, himself a Colossian, was now in Ephesus with the apostle—who, in the hope of winning him for the faith and of accomplishing his amicable restoration to his master, arranged for a meeting between him and the apostle. On this hypothesis see further, p. 161.

On this matter our data are insufficient, and it has no great relevance for our present inquiry. We may claim, however, that anything that can be gathered about the previous relations of the slave and the apostle tells not against, but rather in favour of, Ephesus as their place of meeting on the present occasion.

ii. *Paul's Request for a Lodging at Colossæ*

Further, we learn from Philem. 22 that Paul hoped soon to visit Colossæ and even asked arrangements to be made for a lodging. How natural such a visit would be at a time when his activities, temporarily interrupted by imprisonment, were directed towards the evangelisation of Asia: not far from him as he lay at Ephesus were those churches in the Lycus valley which in some indirect way no doubt owed their origin to his missionary-work in the province, but which he had never so far visited, and in at least one of which, Colossæ, the conditions gave him grave cause for anxiety. On the other hand, how unlikely was he to contemplate such a visit, let alone give thought to the provision of a lodging there, when he lay a prisoner at Rome. Paul liked to see the standards of the cross advance with the same order and security as those of an invading army. Even when he was at Ephesus

his eyes were set on Rome (Acts xix. 21), and his work in Asia and that in Macedonia and Greece were from one point of view stages in the onward progress towards the establishment of the gospel in the Imperial capital. At each of these stages his line of advance had to be secured. That is why, having been led by the Spirit at an earlier stage to pass by Ephesus and to go on to Greece, he was now devoting three years to the establishment of Christianity in the main centres of the province of Asia ; and the cities of the Lycus valley had this special interest for him that they lay on the main route that connected Ephesus with Pisidian Antioch, Tarsus, and Syrian Antioch. That, too, explains in part at least the anxiety with which, about the time of his Ephesian residence, he regarded the conditions of his churches in Corinth and Macedonia—an anxiety on which fresh light will be shed if we accept Philippians as written from Ephesus. But when, in fulfilment of his great ambition, Paul had at last reached the great Imperial city, eager so to present his gospel that it might win, if not personal acceptance, at least understanding and perhaps also official recognition from those who ruled the destinies of the Empire, it is much less natural that his thoughts from prison should turn back (as they do in Philemon and Colossians) to the congregation in a comparatively obscure country town in Asia Minor, to which immediately on his release he was to proceed with such haste that he wished even now a lodging to be looked out for him. Paul himself tells us with how different a design he advanced on Rome. Even Rome was to provide the beginning for a new work of extension in the West. From Rome he meant, not to turn back to the Lycus valley, but to advance into Spain (Rom. xv. 24).

iii. *Paul's Relations with the Colossian Church*

Apart from the fact that Colossians and Philemon go together, there is a special reason for assigning Colossians to the Ephesian period. The Colossian church was one which Paul had not himself visited; but he had received news of it from Epaphras, himself apparently a Colossian, through whose evangelistic zeal the church at Colossæ, and probably also the churches in Hierapolis and Laodicea, owed their origin. When had this missionary expansion taken place? Almost certainly during Paul's residence in Asia, when, as we hear repeatedly in Acts (xix. 10, 17, 26; cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 19), the whole province of Asia was evangelised. But if we believe that the church at Colossæ was founded during the Ephesian period, that is almost enough to exclude the view that the Colossian letter was not written till after Paul's arrival in Rome. For, apart from the fact that Paul would almost certainly have visited Colossæ [1] before leaving the province of Asia (and he had not visited it before this letter), the letter gives the undeniable impression that the Christianity of Colossæ is a product of comparatively recent origin. This is probably Paul's first important letter to the community whose foundation has given him so much joy. Some little time must, it is true, have intervened since the establishment of the church to allow for the development of the false teaching which the epistle seeks to combat, but that time need not have been long; and if the foundation of the church belonged to the earlier part of the Ephesian period, when Paul was seeking by his emissaries to extend and consolidate the work throughout the province, the false

[1] The prospect of such a visit is referred to in Philem. 22; but this, we have seen reason to believe, was written from Ephesus.

teaching would have had abundant time to develop before the end of the Ephesian stay.

iv. *The Movements of Timothy and of Paul*

A cogent argument for assigning Philippians to Ephesus is provided by a study of the references in that epistle to the movements of Timothy and of Paul. When Philippians was written Timothy was expected soon to visit Philippi (ii. 19). With this agrees the evidence (*a*) of Acts xix. 22, which tells that from Ephesus Paul dispatched Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia, (*b*) of 1 Corinthians (written from Ephesus, and, as I believe, shortly after Philippians), which twice (iv. 17, xvi. 10) refers to the possibility of Timothy's coming to Corinth, a journey which may be regarded as a continuation of that to Macedonia. Further we see that in Philippians, as in Acts and 1 Corinthians, this visit of Timothy's is expected to be followed, if all goes well, by a visit from the apostle himself (Phil. ii. 24; Acts xix. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 5, cf. iv. 19). To appreciate the full force of this argument it will be advisable to trace more precisely the movements of Timothy up to this point.

(a) The Evidence of Acts

According to Acts xvi. 1, it was at Lystra, early in the so-called second missionary journey, that Timothy first joined Paul, apparently accompanying him and Silas during the subsequent wanderings in Asia and then crossing to Europe, taking part (as it would appear, though apart from Acts xvii. 15 this is not definitely stated) in the first visit to Philippi and Thessalonica,[1] and eventually rejoining Paul, who had gone on ahead,

[1] According to 1 Thess. iii. 1 f. Paul dispatched Timothy (from Athens ?) on a special mission to Thessalonica.

at Corinth (Acts xviii. 5, cf. 1 Thess. iii. 6). The essential truth of this picture is borne out by Paul's Thessalonian letters, which (despite the efforts of some critics to see in them references to a later period of activity and to attribute at least 1 Thessalonians to the third missionary journey) I regard as written from Corinth shortly after Paul's first arrival there. When next Acts introduces us to Timothy (xix. 22) Paul is in Ephesus with his eyes turned westwards towards Macedonia and Greece, and even (though Jerusalem must first be visited) towards Rome; but being in the meantime detained in Asia (Acts gives no explanation of this, beyond the account of the rioting) he dispatched two of his lieutenants, Timothy and Erastus, to Macedonia. Of Timothy's subsequent movements Acts tells us nothing until, after Paul's visit to Corinth, Timothy and several others are mentioned as accompanying him on the journey that in the end leads to Jerusalem.

(b) The Evidence of the Epistles

On the assumption of their Ephesian origin we can say that Timothy was present at Ephesus at the time when Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians were written, for his name is included with Paul's in the opening salutation of all these epistles—not, however, in that of Ephesians. Further, in writing to the Philippians Paul expresses the hope that ere long, when circumstances permit, he will be able to send Timothy to visit them (ii. 19). It is therefore an argument for the Ephesian origin of Philippians that we are able to connect this proposed visit of Timothy with that mentioned in Acts xix. 22. Further, as in 1 Corinthians (written, as we shall see reason to believe, at a date slightly later than Philippians) Paul twice mentions the possibility of

Timothy's visiting Corinth (iv. 17, xvi. 10), this visit of Timothy's to the West, referred to in Acts and Philippians, receives corroboration from a source whose testimony, on the score of date and reliability, cannot be doubted. Of these two references in 1 Corinthians, the second is expressed hypothetically: 'if Timothy arrives.' Since Paul wrote the earlier part of the letter something has evidently raised a doubt in his mind whether the prospective visit will be carried out; in any case it is not to involve a long stay: the apostle expects Timothy to rejoin him soon after it (xvi. 11). In the earlier reference, iv. 17, Paul says *ἔπεμψα ὑμῖν Τιμόθεον*. Is this an epistolary aorist ('I am sending') or has Timothy already left? The point has been much debated, and in the end the question will be settled by the reconstruction that has most claim to probability. One fact that undoubtedly calls for attention is that Timothy, although on the general evidence of Acts (cf. also 2 Cor. i. 19) he seems to have worked in Corinth with Paul and Silas, is not included in the salutation of 1 Corinthians, as he later is in that of 2 Corinthians; and from this one may argue with some confidence that he was not present with Paul when 1 Corinthians was written: in other words, between the writing of Philippians and that of 1 Corinthians the apostle had dispatched him (and Erastus) to Macedonia.

Timothy probably did go to Macedonia as Acts says he did. It is also probable that, on this occasion at least, he did *not* go on to Corinth, for 2 Corinthians, though it has more than one reference to Titus's visit to Corinth, gives no hint that Timothy had been there. Erastus, however, completed the journey—Timothy is informed of this in a private letter (2 Tim. iv. 20), and a year or so afterwards, when Paul himself is in

Corinth, Erastus is there occupying the honoured post of city-chamberlain (Rom. xvi. 23).

Thus an Ephesian origin for Philippians may be inferred from the way in which the references in these epistles to Timothy fit in with what we otherwise know of Timothy's movements at this time. Is there any justification, we may ask in passing, for imagining that Timothy ever was in Rome? Acts gives no hint that he was; and, as we shall see in Chapter XIV, no safe argument can be built on the evidence of 2 Timothy.

v. *Frequency of Communication between Paul and Philippi*

As a further argument for the Ephesian origin of Philippians we may note that the epistle gives evidence of a frequency of communication between the apostle and his Philippian church which is scarcely credible if he writes from Rome, but is easy to understand if he writes from Ephesus.

The journey from Rome to Philippi, measured even as the crow flies, was about 600 miles, and it was a journey attended with considerable difficulty, involving (by the most natural route) a land journey to Brundisium (360 miles), a sea-crossing to Dyrrachium and Aulona (2 days), and a long journey of 380 miles along the Via Egnatia to Philippi. (See Hastings, *D.B.*, v. 385). Yet since Paul has been put into prison (at Rome let us say), (1) news of the apostle has travelled to Philippi; (2) the Philippians have made a collection, and have sent it by their messenger Epaphroditus to Rome; (3) their messenger having fallen ill, news of his illness has been carried back to Philippi; (4) the news has caused considerable grief at Philippi, and report of that

grief is carried back to the invalid at Rome (Phil. iii. 25 ff.).

So much for past journeys: we turn now to look at prospective ones.

We may pass over the fact that Epaphroditus is to be sent back (probably with the letter)—it was only natural that the invalid should return to his native city. But (1) Timothy is to be sent as soon as opportunity affords; (2) Timothy is expected to return and report to Paul, Paul presumably remaining meantime at Rome; (3) Paul, having received Timothy's report, hopes to visit Philippi in person. These various journeys are indicated in Phil. ii. 19–24.

Deissmann, in his instructive contribution to the volume of *Anatolian Studies, Presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay*, emphasises how much more easy of accomplishment all these journeys seem to the reader in his study than they would have been to those who had to make them. Yet we do not get from Philippians the impression that the journeys, accomplished or in prospect, involved a very great degree of hardship—the easy way in which the writer twice introduced the word ταχέως (first of Timothy's journey, then of his own, ii. 19, 24; so too ἐξαυτῆς in ii. 23) may in fact be taken to imply the opposite. Certainly they would have been much more easily accomplished—apart from the fact that Paul's progress would then have been in a much more natural direction, keeping ever westwards—if the place of writing were not Rome but Ephesus.

It so happens, as Deissmann shows, that we can calculate from Acts the approximate time that a journey between Philippi and Ephesus would take.

According to Acts xx. 6, a journey from Philippi to Troas occupied five days; the converse journey, with

apparently a favouring wind, takes three days (Acts xvi. 11). From Troas to Assos would be a few hours' journey (Paul walked it), and from Assos to Miletus, according to Acts xx. 13 ff., took four more days; on a boat which was to touch at Ephesus, four days might suffice for the stage from Troas to Ephesus.

Thus for the journey between Philippi and Ephesus a period of from seven to ten days would suffice. Contrast this with the time and the toil involved in a journey to Rome. Most of those 740 land miles were probably to be accomplished on foot, and he would be a good traveller who, for such a distance, averaged as much as fifteen miles a day; and there was also the intermediate sea-journey with uncertain boat connections. Have we not here a finger-post that points clearly to Ephesus rather than to Rome?

vi. *The Gift sent from Philippi*

At the conclusion of the Epistle to the Philippians (iv. 10 ff.) Paul, in thanking the church for the gift they had sent him by the hands of Epaphroditus, expressed the joy it had been to him that, after an interval during which the opportunity had been denied to them, they had once again been able to show in a practical way their desire to share with him in his activities and his sufferings for the gospel's sake. "You Philippians," he goes on, "are well aware that in the early days of the gospel, when I had left Macedonia, no church but yourselves had any financial dealings with me; even when I was in Thessalonica you sent money more than once for my needs" (Moffatt's translation). Paul here is clearly recalling the time of his first missionary-work in Europe. The first field on that occasion had been Philippi; and when he went on from there to Thessalonica, the Philip-

pians began even then to contribute to his support.[1] Afterwards when he had 'left Macedonia,' *i.e.* when he had gone south to Achaia, their contributions continued—a fact of which we have corroborative evidence in 2 Cor. xi. 9, where Paul says that at Corinth his wants were supplied by the brethren who came from Macedonia. Paul's reference to what happened after he left Macedonia applies of course only to the immediately succeeding period: it cannot reasonably be extended to include the mission in Ephesus. Of any later contributions until the present one, he says nothing: he only rejoices that now at last the Philippians have again been able to show their interest in him and in the work.

The phrase 'now at last' clearly implies that some space of time has intervened since their last gift; but if Paul is now writing after a two years' imprisonment in Rome, then some twelve years have elapsed since he left Macedonia; even if we imagine that the Philippians continued their financial aid during all the time the apostle was at Corinth, over ten years have passed during which the good Philippians, who at the beginning seem to have contributed frequently in the space of a few months,[2] have sent no contribution whatsoever. Yet during much of that long period Paul had been comparatively near

[1] We shall consider later (p. 264) how, while refusing to accept support from a church in which he was still labouring, Paul probably sought to get the churches he had left to contribute to the advance of the missionary-cause.

[2] On the most natural interpretation of Phil. iv. 16, they had contributed more than once during the comparatively short time the apostle spent in Thessalonica—a time which, on the simplest reading of the narrative in Acts xvii. 1 ff. did not extend beyond three weeks. It is an undue straining of language to make the Philippians passage imply: 'both when I was at Thessalonica and repeatedly on other occasions.'

them—he had spent three troublous years at Ephesus; he had apparently passed through Macedonia and gone on to Illyricum (cf. p. 220); he had revisited Corinth; after which there had come the arrest at Jerusalem and the long years of waiting as a prisoner at Cæsarea—so that previous to his arrest there were six years when the rapid expansion of the gospel on the one hand and the sufferings of the apostle on the other would have made contributions from his churches especially valuable. Is not the whole situation far more intelligible if the gift for which Paul now thanks the Philippians had been received by him during that period of storm and stress on which, as the Philippians would have heard, he had now entered at Ephesus? There is no difficulty in the implication (iv. 10) that some time has elapsed between this and their last previous contribution; the phrase 'when I left Macedonia' need not be taken to imply that their contributions continued during the whole of the Achaian ministry, and in any case Paul may well have been a year or more in Ephesus before the crisis arose during which Philippians was written. Such an interval explains far more naturally the language of ver. 10 than would an interval of some ten years.

Note.—With regard to this gift from the Philippians a subsidiary problem arises which we may take occasion to note here. It is natural to infer from ver. 18 that this is the first acknowledgment which the apostle makes of the gift. That some considerable time, however, has elapsed since the arrival of the gift is made plain from the reference in ii. 25 ff. to the illness of Epaphroditus, the delegate of the Philippians by whom the gift had been brought; for, as we have already pointed out, it appears not merely that word of Epaphroditus's illness

had travelled to Philippi, but also that a report had come back to Paul and Epaphroditus of the grief with which the Philippians had heard this distressing news. It may seem strange that the gift was not acknowledged earlier; and on the ground that the apostle was not likely to have been so remiss some have postulated an intermediate letter of thanks, and sought to find corroboration for the hypothesis in the language of iii. 1, with its seeming reference to a previous communication. This assumption of an earlier acknowledgment is quite gratuitous and, in view of the plain language of iv. 18, improbable.

Even less foundation is there for the suggestion that the delay in the acknowledgment, coupled with the protestations of independence in iv. 11 ff., points to a reluctance on Paul's part to acknowledge indebtedness. Such an ungenerous attitude is wholly out of keeping both with what we know of the character of the apostle and with the undeniably warm and affectionate tone of the rest of the letter. Paul, of course, may have wished tactfully to remind the Philippians that he had no desire to receive gifts for his own personal use, but only for the sake of the gospel. Apart from this, a simple and natural reading of the situation is that circumstances did not allow of the dispatch of a letter at an earlier date; for it was not through any official messenger, but by some form of flying rumour, and contrary to the desire of the invalid himself, that news of Epaphroditus's illness had reached Philippi. A contributory cause of the delay may quite easily have been the desire, to which ii. 26 bears witness, to hide as long as possible from the Philippians the news of their envoy's distress. In fact the most reasonable explanation would be that Paul delayed his answer until Epa-

phroditus[1] should have sufficiently recovered to be himself the bearer of the letter.

One may add that if Paul wrote from Ephesus, the delay need not have been more than a few weeks—not at all a long interval, especially if Paul meant his letter to deal with other matters besides acknowledgment of the gift; but the delay would have been considerably longer, and therefore more difficult to explain, if we picture Epaphroditus and Paul as being in Rome.

vii. *The 'Conflict' of Phil. i.* 30

Lastly we may cite as supporting an Ephesian rather than a Roman origin of Philippians the language of the apostle in Phil. i. 30, where, after encouraging his converts to fight the good fight, he adds that the conflict which they are called to wage for the gospel's sake is the same which, '*as once you saw and now hear with regard to me*, I too have to wage.' '*As once you saw*': this of course would recall the hostility which the apostle had met with on his visit to Philippi (Acts xvi. 19 ff.) when he had been flogged and imprisoned. '*And now you hear*': is this to be referred to something which happened at least twelve years after? True, the whole period of those intervening twelve years has been one unceasing conflict; but Paul's thoughts are not of the duration of the fight, but of the corroborative testimony of what they once saw and what they now hear, and the double phrase is robbed of its point unless the second piece of evidence follows closely on the first. Though

[1] Even if, as has been suggested, the Philippians *may* have meant Epaphroditus to stay on for a time to render such assistance to the apostle as was in his power, his illness might have made the apostle anxious to send him home as soon as he was fit for the journey.

the conflict is not to be interpreted merely in terms of imprisonment, as is evident from the fact that the Philippians are said on their part to be facing the same ordeal, still the fact that at Philippi ('*you saw*') Paul had been imprisoned and now ('*you hear*') he is in prison again means that that aspect of the conflict is inevitably present to his mind : and on our reconstruction the first imprisonment which he endured after leaving Philippi was the one at Ephesus during which the Epistle to the Philippians was written.

We may add that during these twelve years that had elapsed between his first coming to Philippi and his arrival in Rome the apostle paid two further visits to Macedonia, both (as far as we know) uneventful (Acts xx. 1 f. ; 4–6) ; but in our present passage these are ignored if we assume that he is now writing from Rome. Is not his reference to the conflict which the Philippians saw him wage to be explained much more naturally if the occasion when it took place was his sole previous visit, or (to put it otherwise) if he is now writing before the time of his second and third visit ? This again points to an Ephesian rather than a Roman origin of the Epistle.

CHAPTER VIII

ARGUMENTS AGAINST CONNECTING THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES WITH ROME

We may at this point recall that the attribution of the Imprisonment Epistles to Rome involves a series of difficulties which have never been adequately met.

Would that we knew more of the circumstances surrounding Paul's sojourn in the Imperial city! But, unless we are wantonly to set aside the account in Acts as lacking historical value, certain facts emerge with tolerable clearness. The apostle had come to Rome, having of his own accord appealed to Cæsar, his object being primarily to escape the intolerant persecution of the Jerusalem Jews, and further to have an opportunity of vindicating Christianity before the Imperial authorities. He was thus not a prisoner of the Roman government. Festus and Agrippa had decided that, to say nothing of death, there was no reason why he should even be kept a prisoner (Acts xxvi. 31 f.). Had it not been for his appeal, therefore, he might, so far as Rome was concerned, have been at liberty. It is thus only what might be expected that while awaiting the hearing of his appeal he should be in his own lodging, undergoing very little restraint (Acts xxviii. 16, 30 f.). Even Jewish hostility was, at least at the beginning, non-existent: the Jews at Rome assure him that no denunciations of him had reached them from Jerusalem (Acts xxviii. 21).

A very different situation is revealed when we turn

to the Imprisonment Epistles. As regards the jealous and unfriendly attitude to the apostle which, according to Phil. i. 15 ff., characterised some of the Christian brethren in the city where Paul was imprisoned, we perhaps cannot in the absence of sufficient data rule this out as inapplicable to the church in Rome, but it would have a special applicability to the church of Ephesus (cf. pp. 271 ff.). Before Philippians had been written the situation had been menacing in the extreme, and the menace had not yet been wholly removed. Jewish opposition is everywhere rampant.[1] At least two of the apostle's companions, Aristarchus of Thessalonica and Epaphras of Colossæ, are at one time in prison with him (Col. iv. 10 ; Philem. 23). What fanatical outburst, we may well ask, has occurred to compel these loyal but, so far as we know, unimportant friends to share their master's captivity ? So far as Aristarchus is concerned we know from Acts xix. 29 that he *was* arrested in the outbreak of mob violence at Ephesus ; but we are not prepared for such an exhibition of intolerance at Rome.

We do not know enough of the development of events during Paul's residence at Rome to assert categorically that the situation here revealed can *not* belong to the Roman period ; but we have at least good reason to be sceptical, and we can now go on to push our doubts even further back.

According to the traditional view, Aristarchus, Epaphras, Onesimus, Timothy, Mark, Tychicus, Jesus Justus, Luke, Demas, Epaphroditus are all in Rome. That of course is not impossible ; but is it probable ? With the possible exception of Aristarchus, Mark, and Luke, we have (outside the Imprisonment Epistles) no evidence

[1] Cf. pp. 275 ff.

whatsoever for associating any one of these friends with Rome.[1]

Aristarchus is a doubtful exception. The last that we hear of him is that he sailed in the same ship as Paul from Cæsarea (Acts xxvii. 2); but that does not prove that he went all the way to Rome, especially as the apostle changed ship *en route* (Acts xxvii. 6). To Lightfoot's fair and critical mind [2] the balance of probability is that Aristarchus parted from the apostle at Myra, his destination being not Rome, but his native city Thessalonica; and if such a view commended itself to one who, accepting the traditional ascription of Colossians and Philemon to the Roman period, had to postulate the arrival of Aristarchus later in Rome, with how much more force may we use it as indicating that Aristarchus, so far as our knowledge goes, never went to Rome at all. On the other hand, we do know of him (on the independent evidence of Acts) that he was with the apostle in Ephesus, and that there his association with the apostle involved him in arrest, making him in very truth a 'fellow-prisoner.'

Mark probably did in course of time visit Rome, as tradition asserts; but, ruling out 2 Tim. iv. 11 as having no reference to Rome, we have no clear indication that Mark was in Rome as a companion of the apostle's. The very fact that in Col. iv. 10 he was likely, on leaving Paul, to visit Colossæ links up the reference there more naturally with Ephesus.

As regards Luke, it is more than probable that he was

[1] Some of these names occur in the Pastoral Epistles, but we shall see reason later for connecting the references there with Ephesus rather than with Rome.

[2] *Commentary on Philippians*, p. 35.

in Rome with the apostle ; but the mention of his name in Colossians and Philemon can be explained equally well with reference to Ephesus. This, it is true, has been questioned on the ground of the inadequate account given in Acts of the Ephesian ministry ; but, however unsatisfactory may be Luke's account of the earlier part of this period, there can be little doubt that the section (Acts xix. 21–41) giving a statement of Paul's plans and a description of the riot is the work of one who, whether or not he was present at the time, wrote with accurate and detailed knowledge. And we shall see in Chap. XII that it is to the concluding period of the Ephesian ministry, and indeed to an imprisonment following the riot, that the writing of Colossians and Philemon is to be assigned. If, as seems reasonable, the use of the pronoun 'we' in the narrative of Acts is to be taken as indicative of the presence of Luke with the apostle, Luke apparently accompanied his master on the first journey westwards from Troas to Philippi (Acts xvi. 10–16), and much later rejoined him (at Philippi ?) on the journey to Jerusalem which culminated in the apostle's arrest (Acts xx. 5 f.). But it would be quite unjustifiable to argue from this that at no time in the intervening period, including the period of the apostle's stay at Ephesus, was Luke with his master. Communications were easy between Philippi and Ephesus, and during the apostle's three years' residence in Ephesus 'the beloved physician' is not likely to have been content to see nothing of him, especially during a time of intense suffering. One recalls in particular the language of 2 Cor. i. 8 ff., where the apostle tells of the 'distress' in Asia which made him despair of life itself ; even if Luke was at Philippi at that time, is he not likely to have hastened to the apostle's

side ?[1] This, we may add, would agree with our view (*a*) that both the Demetrius riot, of which Luke writes with full knowledge, and the 'distress' of 2 Cor. i. 8, belong to the later period of the Ephesian residence; and (*b*) that Colossians and Philemon, written when Luke was with the apostle, are to be assigned to an imprisonment following on the Demetrius riot.

Onesimus and Epaphroditus, as we saw in Chapter VII, are far more likely to have visited the apostle in Ephesus than in Rome. What, now, of the others ?

Epaphras is apparently a Colossian (Col. iv. 12) who has evangelised his native town, and presumably the neighbouring towns of Laodicea and Hierapolis. How are we to explain his presence now in Rome, and in prison ? It is of course possible that the development of a false teaching which threatened to wreck his Colossian church may have sent him all the way to Rome to seek the wise counsel and assistance of the apostle. But not only does the Colossian church seem, as we have pointed out (p. 76), to have been a recent foundation (and it must surely have been founded during Paul's Ephesian ministry), but also Epaphras's visit to the apostle, especially if it was followed by arrest and imprisonment, points far more naturally to Ephesus than to Rome. At the time of the Demetrius riot, when there would be present (if it occurred, as seems probable, at a festival time) representatives from other towns round about, and the cry was raised that not merely in Ephesus, but over almost the whole of Asia the new faith was spreading its sinister influence (Acts xix. 26), it would be natural that so enthusiastic a coadjutor as Epaphras should

[1] In Chapter XIV we shall argue that 2 Tim. iv. 16 f. refers to the same tragic experience as does 2 Cor. i. 8 f.; and according to 2 Tim. iv. 11, Luke was with the apostle on that occasion.

become with the apostle a victim of popular fury. And especially at such a time, when the work to which he had set his hand had scarcely begun, we can understand how he would agonise over the infant churches which had so suddenly and unexpectedly been deprived of his oversight (Col. iv. 12, 13).

Tychicus was a native of Asia (Acts xx. 4—this probably implies that he was an Ephesian, as indeed is asserted in the reading of Codex D) ; and apart from Titus iii. 12, where the reference if not to Crete is probably to Achaia, all that we know of him connects him with work in and around Ephesus. There is no good reason to believe that he was with Paul in Rome. The mission referred to in Col. iv. 7 f. and Eph. vi. 21 f. would be far more naturally entered on from Ephesus as a base.

Was Timothy with the apostle in Rome ? We have no ground for thinking that he was. We have elsewhere (pp. 77 ff.) traced his movements in some detail. Here we may note that, though he is present with Paul when Philippians is written, this is far more likely to have been in Ephesus than in Rome ; and we shall see (p. 185) that Paul cannot have been writing from Rome when in 2 Tim. iv. 9 he invited Timothy to join him. Acts, which frequently refers to Timothy, gives no hint that he was in Rome with the apostle. On the other hand, we do know (both from Acts and from the Corinthian epistles) that he was closely associated with the apostle during the Ephesian ministry.

There remain Demas and Jesus Justus. The latter is definitely classified as a Jewish-Christian (Col. iv. 11), but otherwise we know nothing of him ; Demas, not being included among those of the circumcision in iv. 11, is apparently a Gentile, a native (we may presume)

of Thessalonica (2 Tim. iv. 10). We have no reason to connect either of these two companions with Rome; on the other hand, the links which they have with the church in Colossæ (as evidenced by their greetings in Colossians and Philemon) would be more easily explained if they were in Ephesus rather than in Rome when those letters were sent off. And as we shall see when we come in Chapter XIV to study 2 Tim. iv. 9 ff. in greater detail, it was possibly after being with Paul in Ephesus that Demas deserted his master.

Thus, of all the companions whom we know to have been with Paul at the time when he wrote the Imprisonment Epistles, there is not one, with the possible exception of Luke, of whom we can say that it was even probable that he was with the apostle in Rome; while in regard to every one of them there is a strong possibility, which in the case of Aristarchus, Timothy, and Tychicus is a certainty, that they were associated with the apostle in Ephesus.

CHAPTER IX

THE SILENCE OF ACTS REGARDING AN EPHESIAN IMPRISONMENT

If Paul was imprisoned at Ephesus, why has Acts nothing to say about it? Here we have by far the weightiest objection to the theory of an Ephesian imprisonment. The 'argument from silence' does not always require to be taken seriously; but in this case some explanation is undoubtedly called for.

i. *Other Omissions in Acts*

In fairness we may claim at the outset that, surprising as the omission is, its significance ought not to be exaggerated. We have already noted (p. 47) how colourless and curt is the summary in Acts of that busy, anxious, almost tragic period that succeeded the apostle's departure from Ephesus. How little there is in Acts corresponding to the sufferings enumerated in 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff. "Five times received I from the Jews the thirty-nine stripes"—Acts gives us no instance of this; "thrice was I beaten (by the Romans) with rods"—Acts relates only one such beating, at Philippi; "in prisons more abundantly"—up to this period Acts tells of only one imprisonment, that at Philippi; "three times was I shipwrecked; a night and a day I was adrift at sea"—of these experiences there is not a hint in Acts. Thus, to confine ourselves here to this one class

of omission,[1] we may say that, whatever Luke's motive was in writing the book of Acts, it clearly was not to give an account of Paul's sufferings. It may even have been that he refrained from giving unnecessary prominence to these. It is to be noted on the other hand that Acts on a later occasion (viz. in the address to the Ephesian elders, xx. 19) preserves Paul's own testimony to the fact that he suffered grievously at Ephesus as a result of Jewish plots. Further, we may recall that in the story of the Ephesian riot there are occasional abruptnesses and incoherences (cf. the unexplained reference to Alexander, xix. 33, and the omission to tell the subsequent fate of Gaius, Aristarchus, and Paul, xix. 29), which suggest that the narrative is not complete, while the account given of the earlier Ephesian ministry is certainly 'scrappy.'

ii. *The Motive behind the Writing of Acts*

But such reflections do not carry us far towards providing an explanation of Luke's silence. If Paul was imprisoned (perhaps more than once) in Ephesus and Luke omits to mention the fact, he has a reason for so doing. What can that reason be? This raises for us the very much larger question of his reason for writing at all the two books that are associated with his name. Naturally discussion of such a question would carry us far beyond the bounds of our present inquiry,

[1] Among other omissions we may note that Acts has no reference (except incidentally in Paul's address before Felix, xxiv. 17 f.) to the collection for the Judæan Christians which Paul organised in his various Gentile congregations. Further, if Paul after his 'second' missionary journey had any colleague of apostolic rank with him, we are not told so in Acts; but possibly Silas was no longer with Paul, and Timothy more or less took his place.

and we shall content ourselves with a brief statement of certain positions.

As opposed to those who postulate for both Luke (*i.e.* the Gospel) and Acts a date subsequent to A.D. 70, the present writer believes, with Harnack, that (to take up only one problem) " the concluding verses of the Acts of the Apostles, taken in conjunction with the absence of any reference in the book to the result of the trial of St. Paul and to his martyrdom, make it in the highest degree probable that the work was written at a time when St. Paul's trial in Rome had not yet come to an end " (Harnack, *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, p. 99). And if he wrote at such a time, what more probable motive can Luke have had than to prepare a statement of the rise and development of the Christian religion, designed to supply information which it was hoped might reach those who would decide the apostle's fate at Rome ? [1]

If this theory is correct, we can imagine how Luke, who accompanied the apostle on the way up to Jerusalem and was with him during the subsequent two years' imprisonment at Cæsarea, came to see that in a new way he might use his literary gifts in the service of the gospel. He had begun by keeping notes of the apostle's travels ; now he would expand these into a work which might help to vindicate his master in his appeal to Roman justice, and vindicate too the gospel which his master preached. That is why Luke has prefixed to the historical record of Acts the πρῶτος λόγος of the Gospel.

[1] This theory is not altogether new. It was propounded by Aberle as far back as 1855 ; more recently it has received the powerful support of the great Dutch scholar Plooij (for his views see *Expositor*, eighth series, viii. 511 ff., xiii. 108 ff., and ix. 217 ff.). A less convincing statement of the case is J. Ironside Still's book, *St. Paul on Trial* (1923).

That, too, is why the second book takes the form which it does. If it had been meant to provide Christian readers with an historical record of the expansion of the faith, how sadly lacking it would be in historical arrangement and completeness, with its many episodes which are not followed up (*e.g.* the career of Peter after the Jerusalem Council), and its failure to tell us of the work done in other fields than those visited by Paul. But apart from the service the book might directly render to Christian readers, the author hoped that it might be brought under the notice of certain Romans, men in official position, and the view to which he wished to lead them was twofold—(i) that Christianity had suffered in all its stages from the hostility of a bigoted section in Judaism, but that non-Jewish officials, *e.g.* Pilate, Sergius Paulus, Gallio, Festus, and even the Jewish Agrippa had recognised that there was nothing in it which Rome need fear, and in particular that there was no case against Paul, just as there had been none against Jesus ; and (ii) that the Christian religion had grown naturally out of Judaism, so that if Judaism was recognised as a *religio licita* throughout the Empire, so too ought Christianity to be.

So during those two years at Cæsarea and the time that followed at Rome Luke was busy collecting and arranging his material. So far as the Gospel was concerned he wrote first that ' Proto-Luke ' version whose existence Canon Streeter's researches [1] have done so much to establish, and to which later (shall we say during

[1] Cf. *The Four Gospels*, pp. 199 ff. ; though Streeter differs from the present writer as regards the question of date. While believing that Luke made copious notes at Cæsarea, Streeter holds that it was later, probably after the death of Paul, that Luke, having found a copy of Q, composed Proto-Luke ; and naturally he puts the Gospel in its present form later still.

his Roman residence ?) he added certain material derived from Mark, so as to form the present version of his Gospel. In the same way there were probably two versions of the book of Acts.

But it is less with the literary than with the historical aspect of the problem that we are concerned here. Paul had appealed to Cæsar ; and Luke sought to show that in Paul's attitude, and in the attitude of Christianity generally, despite the violent and unrelenting opposition of the Jews there was really nothing to which Rome could take exception. No crime had been formulated against the apostle ; the Jewish accusations concerned only Jewish laws and customs. So Gallio had seen ; so too Claudius Lysias, who had effected the arrest at Jerusalem (xxiii. 29) ; so too Festus and Agrippa. But, though Rome was likely to take a more unbiased view of the case than would a court sitting in Jerusalem, Judaism had many powerful friends in Rome whose influence might be enlisted against the apostle. Thus Luke expressly tells us (Acts xxiv. 24, 27) that the wife of Felix was a Jewess (Drusilla, a daughter of Herod Agrippa), and that a desire to ingratiate himself with the Jews was an element in the governor's temporising policy which kept Paul a prisoner for two years at Cæsarea ; and Poppæa Sabina, to whose sinister influence Nero had become a slave by the time Paul arrived in Jerusalem, was a proselyte to Judaism.

If Nero cared to listen to it, Paul's case would come before him personally, and it might go hard with the apostle if Nero's mind at the time had been prejudiced against him by Jewish influences. Fortunately among those whom he would normally consult on such a matter (the *amici Cæsaris*) there were men whose knowledge of the world and whose sense of justice would lead

them naturally to a truer view of the case. Of these the most outstanding by far was the Stoic philosopher Lucius Annæus Seneca, Nero's former tutor and now his chief minister, whose influence over his master was not notably on the wane until the year 62.[1] Tradition, as is well known, came to ascribe to Seneca a friendship with Paul and an interest in Christianity, and we need not dismiss the tradition as devoid of probability. But, confining ourselves here to known facts, we recall how Luke is careful to point out that Seneca's own brother, *dulcis Gallio* as he seems to have been affectionately called, and who was now alive and enjoying considerable popularity at Rome, refused during his proconsulship at Corinth to allow the Imperial power to be used as a tool by Jewish hatred of the apostle ; and it would be the hope of Luke and of the other friends of Paul that Gallio's example would now be followed by his more powerful brother.

iii. *The Proconsul at Ephesus*

From this consideration of the motives underlying the composition of Acts as a whole we turn again to the events at Ephesus. At Ephesus, more than at any other place outside Jerusalem, Paul was on our view subjected to violent hostility, mainly organised by Judaism. Despite this hostility Christianity made rapid and extensive progress, and won for itself the sympathetic interest and protection of responsible officials. Not once, however, does Luke mention a Roman official in connection with Ephesus ; yet the proconsul of Asia

[1] As Paul's residence in Rome was during the years 60–2, we may ask whether the failure of Seneca's influence and the growing power of Poppæa may have resulted in Paul's condemnation. On this view there would be only one Roman imprisonment.

resided there, and nothing is more certain than that at Ephesus, as at Corinth, the Jews would have sought to invoke the aid of Rome against the apostle. Further, if there was any accusation of ἱεροσυλία, involving appropriation of temple funds, the case was bound to go to the proconsul. Yet Luke does not merely omit mention of his name ; apart from an indirect reference to ' proconsuls ' in the municipal secretary's speech (Acts xix. 38) there is not even a hint that the case ever engaged the proconsul's attention. Here, then, is a factor in the case which demands consideration, and that no matter whether we are advocates or opponents of the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment. Can it have been that, unlike Gallio, the proconsul at Ephesus gave way too readily to the fury of the Jewish mob, and treated Paul with a severity which led Luke to omit all mention of the case ? It is indeed not improbable that at Ephesus the apostle endured one or more of those floggings by the lictors of which he tells in 2 Cor. xi. 24. But had the proconsul upheld the charges that were made against the apostle—charges involving, as it would appear, death (in the arena ?) or a long imprisonment—there would have been a clear indication of this in the prolongation of the apostle's stay at Ephesus or, more likely, in an appeal from the sentence to Rome. In the absence of any such indication we are driven to regard it as altogether more probable that the attitude of the proconsul at Ephesus towards the new religion did not differ materially from that of other Roman governors. Paul, we believe, was arraigned before him, but after some delay (involving imprisonment) was acquitted. But the question still remains : why does Luke have not a word to say of the proconsul, or the part which he played in relation to Paul ?

University of Southern California

It would clearly be a matter of much interest and possible importance to know who was proconsul at Ephesus during Paul's ministry there ; and, as it happens, we not merely know his name, but we know some interesting facts about him which perhaps go far to explain why Luke omits all reference to him.

If we turn to the opening paragraph of Book XIII of Tacitus's *Annals*,[1] dealing with the beginning of Nero's reign (A.D. 54), we read as follows (I venture to reproduce Professor Ramsay's translation) : " The first victim of the new reign was Junius Silanus, Proconsul of Asia. His death was brought about by Agrippina's devices, unknown to Nero ; nor was it provoked by any turbulent element in his character. He was a man of sluggish nature, and previous Emperors had treated him with contempt : Gaius Cæsar used to call him ' The Golden Sheep.' But Agrippina was afraid of him. She feared he might avenge the death of his brother Lucius, which had been her doing ; and popular talk kept saying that instead of a lad like Nero, barely out of his 'teens, who had won the Empire by a crime, it would be better to have a man of ripe age, of blameless life and noble blood, and moreover—what was still accounted of—a descendant of the Cæsars ; for Silanus too was a great-great-grandson of the Divine Augustus. Such were the reasons for his death. The deed was done by Publius Celer, a Roman knight, and a freedman called Helius, who had charge of the Emperor's affairs in Asia ; these two administered poison to the Proconsul at a banquet, in a manner too open to escape detection."

Similarly we have the following double reference

[1] I owe to my colleague Professor H. J. Rose the happy suggestion that Tacitus's *Annals* might shed light on the matter.

in Dio Cassius, lxi. 6; 4, 5. "Agrippina was ever ready to attempt the most daring undertakings; for example, she caused the death of Marcus Junius Silanus, sending him some of the poison with which she had treacherously murdered her husband." "Silanus was governor of Asia, and was in no respect inferior to the rest of his family. It was for this reason more than any other, she said, that she killed him, as she did not wish him to be preferred to Nero because of her son's manner of life. Moreover, she[1] had made traffic of everything and raised money from the most trivial and the basest sources" (Loeb Translation).

Now if Acts was, as we have urged, a document prepared to assist Paul in his appeal to Cæsar (Nero), it is not hard to see that the name Silanus was one which it was politic not to refer to. At the time when he was proconsul in Asia M. Junius Silanus was marked out by popular approval as one more likely to adorn the principate[2] than the youthful Nero; and he was still remembered as the first of the many victims of Nero's reign. Nor was he the only member of his family to suffer from the intrigues of the time. His distinguished and popular brother Lucius Silanus, whom the Emperor Claudius had thought worthy to betroth to his daughter Octavia, had five years before been shamefully attacked by Agrippina's minion Vitellius, so that Octavia might be reserved as a future bride for her son Nero, at this time a boy of twelve; and on the day when Agrippina ascended the throne as the

[1] The question might be raised whether the subject of this sentence is not Silanus rather than Agrippina; but this is unlikely.

[2] He stood in the same blood-relationship to Augustus as Nero himself did, both being great-great-grandsons; and indeed he and the members of his family were, apart from Nero, the only direct descendants of Augustus who were still alive.

consort of Claudius, Silanus committed suicide. Involved in his downfall was his sister, Junia Calvina, *sane decora et procax* as Tacitus calls her, her name being associated with her brother's in a scandalous but baseless accusation which secured her expulsion from Italy (Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 3, 4, 8). In the year following the murder of the proconsul at Ephesus another less reputable member of the family, Junia Silana, who sought to accomplish Agrippina's downfall by concocting against her a charge of treason, was so successfully denounced by the queen-mother that Nero sent her into exile (Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 22); and, to complete the tale by the story of a later episode, Torquatus Silanus was in the year 64 accused of managing his private household on so lavish a scale as to suggest over-reaching ambition and treasonable designs, and was driven to commit suicide. Does not this long story of murder and intrigue suggest that Luke, in preparing a statement to be put before Nero, had good reason to omit all reference to the Proconsul of Ephesus ?

In the story of the proconsul's death there is one further fact that deserves to be noted. Agrippina's agents in accomplishing his murder were Publius Celer, a Roman knight, and a freedman called Helius, of whom we are told that they 'had charge of the Emperor's affairs in Asia' (*rei familiari principis in Asia impositi*). As we shall see when we come (p. 110) to examine the reference to Cæsar's household in Phil. iv. 22, there was in each senatorial province like Asia not merely a proconsul, who officially represented the senate, but also a *procurator Cæsaris*, appointed by the Emperor and charged with the administration of such funds and property as the Emperor claimed to belong more directly to his *res familiaris* or *fiscus*. In such a situation there

were abundant openings for suspicion, rivalry, and intrigue ; and it naturally suited an ambitious or selfish emperor to advance the power of his procurator at the expense of that of the proconsul. In the days of Augustus and Tiberius the power of procurators was strictly limited ; but Claudius got the Senate to confer on them, *inter alia*, the right to decide fiscal claims, which previously had gone to the courts of law, and even his 'household freedmen,' says Tacitus (*libertos quos rei familiari præfecerat*), 'he placed on the same level as himself and the laws' (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 60). This enactment, we may note, was passed in the year 53, *i.e.* at a time when Paul was at Ephesus ; and as Agrippina's machinations were at this time unceasing and as Asia was the most important of the senatorial provinces, one is tempted to suggest that by this means Agrippina was already seeking to undermine the authority of the proconsul at Ephesus. This attempt to exalt the prestige and power of the procurator prepares us for the step which followed, when in the next year two of those officials acted as Agrippina's agents in securing the murder of the proconsul. These agents were naturally rewarded by the favour of the Emperor. Celer remained in Asia, where he practised extortion on such a scale that even Nero did not dare to acquit him of the charge which the province brought against him (A.D. 57), though he allowed the trial to drag on, says Tacitus, until the accused should die of old age (*Ann.* xiii. 33). Helius's advancement was such that when at a later date (67–9) Nero went on his tour to Greece this freedman was left to supervise the affairs of Rome and Italy.

The question may be raised : what happened with regard to the administration of the province during

the vacancy caused by the proconsul's death? In the speech of the Ephesian municipal secretary there is a strange reference to 'proconsuls' (in the plural), to whom the citizens are reminded that they may appeal if they have any grievance. It is possible that the plural here may be simply generic; but if another explanation is looked for, may it be that the two agents of the murder exercised proconsular authority until the arrival of the new governor? If so, it would mean that the death of Silanus was anterior to the Demetrius riot, or, to put the same fact otherwise, that the Demetrius riot was later than the proconsul's death in 54. In this connection, however, we recall that on our reconstruction the serious charge of temple robbery had previously (p. 44) been brought by the Ephesian Jews against the apostle; he had been flung into prison; and, as we see from Philippians, which was written on that occasion, the apostle's life for a time seemed to be seriously threatened. Shall we say that during this crisis the fairmindedness of Silanus intervened and saved the apostle from the fury of his persecutors?

The year when Junius Silanus, the proconsul at Ephesus, met his death was the year 54. Paul's residence at Ephesus was apparently from 52 to 54, or more probably 55. Thus almost certainly we have here the governor before whom Paul would be arraigned, especially if (as we shall argue later) there was an impeachment some considerable time before the end of the apostle's stay in Ephesus. All that we know of him leads us to regard it as probable that, like the other officials of whom we read at Ephesus, viz. the Asiarchs and the municipal secretary, he showed more sympathy with Paul than with his Jewish accusers. But to have appealed to the fact that the proconsul at Ephesus had been a

protector of the apostle and of the Christian movement might have been to do the worst possible service to Paul in his trial before Nero ; and such an appeal would have been doubly unfortunate if at the time of the trial the freedman who had carried out the proconsul's murder was now in Rome and had the ear of the Emperor. We recall further (cf. p. 96) that Luke's narrative of Paul's Ephesian troubles is clearly incomplete and in parts incoherent ; and this fact suggests the question whether his original narrative may not at a later date have suffered mutilation. May he, indeed, have himself decided to omit or to modify certain things which he had previously included in it ? We may add that there is reason to believe (pp. 154 ff.) that Luke did not join Paul in Ephesus until about the time of the Demetrius riot ; and if he himself was not present at the time of the earlier crisis, this fact may provide a further reason why he has given no account of it.

CHAPTER X

OBJECTIONS TO ASCRIBING THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES TO EPHESUS

i. *The Reference in Philippians to the Prætorium and to Cæsar's Household*

In Philippians there are two references which have often been erroneously assumed to indicate that the letter was written from Rome, viz. i. 13, where the apostle refers to his bonds as having become known 'in all the prætorium' (ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ), and iv. 22, where a special greeting is sent from 'those who are of Cæsar's household' (οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας). Both of these references, however, agree admirably with the ascription of the letter to Ephesus.

(*a*) '*The Prætorium*.'—From denoting originally the tent of a commander in the field the word *prætorium* came to be used of the official residence of a provincial governor. Thus, to take two examples from the New Testament, we find it in Matt. xxvii. 27 of the residence occupied by Pilate during his annual visit to Jerusalem at the time of the Passover, and in Acts xxiii. 35 it is applied to the governor's official residence at Cæsarea. This use is abundantly vouched for also in inscriptions, and there is no doubt that in Ephesus this would be the most natural, indeed the only natural, interpretation of the term. If, however, we regard the letter as written from Rome we must note that we cannot interpret the phrase with reference to Cæsar's official residence, for

prætorium is strictly a military term, and the Emperor, when in his capital, wished himself to be regarded less as a military than as a civil ruler.

A rival interpretation is to refer the phrase to the prætorian guard, and this is the interpretation generally favoured by those who adopt a Roman origin of the letter. There is some evidence that prætorian troops were occasionally found even in Ephesus, though normally it would be only to an imperial and not to a senatorial province that a detachment of them would be sent, and one would need better evidence before accepting this as a natural interpretation of our present passage.

If, however, we accept the phrase here as denoting the residence of the proconsul of Asia, one qualification requires to be added. It is plain from the way that ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ is followed up by the phrase καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσιν that *prætorium* must be taken not of the place as a building, but of the people who are associated with it. This, of course, constitutes no difficulty. As a Roman citizen, Paul would be detained under some form of *libera custodia*. Quite possibly a room was found for him somewhere within the precincts of the *prætorium*, and there, though he had a soldier to guard him and was bound by a chain, he would be free to welcome visitors and no doubt would have frequent opportunities for intercourse with strangers. Besides, he would have to appear, perhaps frequently, for judicial examination. It seems, therefore, quite needless to adopt for the phrase its limited and doubtful interpretation of a detachment of the prætorian guard when so obviously it might mean those who in any capacity, high or low, as officials or as servants, were attached to the official residence of the proconsul.

(*b*) '*The saints who are of Cæsar's household.*'—We must not allow this phrase to suggest to us the Emperor's palace at Rome, and imagine either that several members of the royal family had become adherents of the Christian Church, or, on the other hand, that the reference is exclusively to menials engaged in the royal kitchen. Cæsar had members of his 'household' in every part of the Empire, a sort of civil service engaged in managing the Imperial property and attending generally to Imperial interests. These officials were naturally found in large numbers in provinces which were definitely assigned to the Emperor, but even in provinces like Asia which were classed as 'senatorial' and where the proconsul was, in theory at least, responsible directly to the senate, there was always a procurator whose duty it was to supervise all property and revenues of the province which, in contrast to what went into the *aerarium* or public treasury, were regarded as belonging to the Emperor's *fiscus*. Under the procurator, who was himself not unlikely to be a freedman, was a large staff of freedmen and slaves, and these, as we know, constituted themselves in the various centres into *collegia* or guilds, a fact which may in part explain why the Christians who belonged to their fraternity in Ephesus sent a collective greeting to Philippi. J. T. Wood in his *Discoveries at Ephesus*, 1877, cites an inscription from the time of the Antonines showing clearly that there were such *collegia* at Ephesus; *curam agunt collegia lib*(*ertorum*) *et servorum domini n*(*ostri*) *Aug*(*usti*) *i*(*nfra*) *s*(*cripta*)[1]; and another inscription of the year A.D. 55 tells of the erection in Kilia in the Thracian Chersonese of a bath for the use of the *populus et familia Cæsaris*.

Such then were the 'members of Cæsar's household'

[1] *Inscriptions from Tombs, Sarcophagi, etc.*, No. 20.

who sent greetings from Ephesus to their fellow-Christians at Philippi. We need not stay to consider more precisely how it came about that they in particular should wish to send greetings. The important thing for us to notice is that the slaves and others who managed the *res familiaris* of the Emperor formed an important fraternity in the life of Ephesus and that numbers of them had been won by Paul for the Christian Church.

ii. *The Situation behind Colossians and Philemon*

The question may be raised whether the general situation revealed in Colossians is compatible with a date so early as that to which we propose to assign the Epistle.

The church at Colossæ may safely be regarded as a product of the forward movement carried on in Asia during the period of Paul's Ephesian ministry. Only indirectly did it owe its origin to Paul—at the time of writing the apostle had not even visited it. Apparently the good seed had been carried to Colossæ by Epaphras, himself a Colossian, who, along with his fellow-townsman Philemon, had perhaps been won for the faith by the apostle's preaching at Ephesus. The beginnings of Christianity at Colossæ may thus not unreasonably be assigned to the end of the first or some time in the second year of Paul's residence at Ephesus. As regards the occasion of his writing the epistle, we shall (Chap. XI) associate it with an imprisonment following the Demetrius riot, which occurred at the end of the Ephesian ministry. When, therefore, Paul wrote to it the church at Colossæ had been in existence for perhaps one and a half or two years.

As he lay a prisoner Paul heard that the Colossian

church had fallen a prey to certain false doctrines. In the main these were Jewish in origin, though various strands of pagan thought also entered into them. So far as concerned doctrine and ritual, importance was attached to circumcision, to months and days, to new moons and sabbaths ; a place was found for the worship of angels ; and Paul in attacking the new teaching implies that it gave too much attention to merely human tradition (ii. 8, 22), to regulations that stood for man's condemnation (ii. 14), and to the elements of the world (ii. 8, 20). In the realm of conduct certain forms of asceticism were encouraged, and much stress seems to have been laid on a kind of devotion (ταπεινοφροσύνη) which Paul condemns as being merely self-imposed (ii. 18, 23).

The time has long gone past when teaching of this kind is explained by reference to second-century Gnosticism. What we have here is not a fully developed system of heretical doctrine, but rather a tendency on the part of an immature church to give a ready welcome to certain new ideas which it has no reason to think are either alien to, or subversive of, the faith which it already professes. Most recent critics have been willing to admit that such a tendency might easily have asserted itself in Colossæ by the time of the apostle's Roman imprisonment, *i.e.* within five years or so of the foundation of the church : but why might it not equally well have asserted itself within *two* years ?

By the time of Paul Hellenistic Judaism, influenced in many ways by pagan thought, had come to find a place within its system for many of those ideas which we see reflected in the Colossian epistle ; and when Epaphras brought to Colossæ the story of the new revelation given to the world in Jesus Christ, some of those who became adherents of the new faith were disposed

(under the influence perhaps of one outstanding teacher ; cf. Paul's use of the singular in ii. 8, 16) to combine with the new certain elements of the old. They had no thought of attacking the gospel or of doing anything that might invalidate it ; their one thought was to supplement it, and to supplement it (where no doubt they thought it was weak) on the speculative or theosophical side (cf. ii. 8, 23), by showing more precisely what place Christ, with the angels and the elements and all those supernatural 'powers' and 'rulers' referred to in i. 16, had in the great divine scheme of creation and redemption. And when was an immature and largely unshepherded church more likely to fall a prey to such teaching than in the first year or two of its existence, when, rejoicing in the welcome it had given to the new faith, it was disposed to go still further and welcome much which at a more developed stage it would have recognised to be incompatible with the gospel ?

As an objection to the early dating of Colossians it has been urged that in none of the other Pauline churches do we see heresy raising its head so early. So far from providing an objection, that very fact lends support to our hypothesis. Paul was indeed a master-builder who, when he founded a church, proceeded to lay a solid foundation of doctrinal truth—though even in his case, as we see from certain early developments after his departure from Thessalonica, a church to which he had not been able to give adequate superintendence at the beginning was liable to become a ready prey to error. But with regard to the church at Colossæ, it was not Paul who founded it but Epaphras, who, having been himself won for the faith at Ephesus, went forth (it may be only a few weeks or months afterwards) to carry the good news to his fellow-townsmen in Colossæ.

We admire his missionary zeal ; but we are not surprised if he did not lay the foundation so deep and sure as Paul himself would have done.

In seeking to refute the false teaching current at Colossæ Paul shows that Christianity is itself in the true sense a philosophy, and expresses his eager desire that the Colossians will make progress in their understanding and appreciation of it. As he develops his theme the apostle makes use of many strange words, and his style, while it resembles that of Ephesians, is much more laboured than in the other great letters of the Ephesian period. But the peculiarities of style and vocabulary in Colossians are adequately explained by the novel character of the subject-matter ; and if, in the opinion of most modern critics, they constitute no valid argument against the Pauline authorship of the epistle, we may claim that just as little do they tell against our hypothesis of its early date.

In Philemon there occurs an incidental reference which appears at first sight to have an important bearing on the question of date. Paul alludes to himself (ver. 9) as ' Paul, the aged ' (πρεσβύτης). Even if this were the correct interpretation, it might be claimed with some show of reason that, recognising as he did that death was continually lying in wait for him, and reconciled as he shows himself in Philippians ' to depart and be with Christ,' Paul might even as early as the days of his Ephesian ministry have come, half-sadly, half-playfully, to allude to himself as an old man. But almost certainly this is not the correct meaning of the passage. By a simple emendation (πρεσβευτής for πρεσβύτης) we obtain the sense of ' ambassador '—Paul who formerly had been an active ambassador remarks that he is now also Christ's prisoner ; and we obtain a corroboration

of this interpretation when we recall how in 2 Corinthians (belonging to the same general period as that to which we wish to assign Philemon) Paul uses the phrase ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν, 'we are ambassadors on Christ's behalf' (v. 20).

iii. *The Theological Conceptions of the Imprisonment Epistles*

A further difficulty may be felt regarding the advanced theology of the Imprisonment Epistles, notably of Colossians and (if we care to consider it) of Ephesians. In these two epistles Christ is viewed not merely as the Son of God or the Jewish Messiah, but as a world-conqueror who has triumphed over all the evil powers in life which conspire for man's destruction. This is sometimes expressed by saying that Christ's work is now regarded as having a cosmical no less than a soteriological significance. He is viewed in His relation to the universe—to the universe as it is (with all its evil forces at work), and to the universe as it is destined to be (when evil is finally cast out). As a step towards the fulfilment of this larger purpose Christ has brought into being a new humanity, seen in the fellowship of the Church, which, deriving its ever-expanding life from Him, is regarded as His body—the body of which He is the head rather than the body of which He is the living spirit.

It can no longer be convincingly urged that in this teaching there is anything which we must dismiss as un-Pauline. The question, however, may be raised whether Paul's religious thought was likely to have reached so developed expression by the time of his Ephesian ministry. We proceed to consider this question.

(*a*) In the first place it is plain that the Christological conceptions of the Imprisonment Epistles have their roots in the earlier and simpler conception of Christ as Redeemer. If Christ is a Redeemer, the question naturally arises: from what does He redeem men? "From the curse of the law," says Paul in Galatians; "from the wrath to come," he says in Thessalonians. But the teaching of the Imprisonment Epistles is that He delivers us from all the evil forces in the universe that work for us death and destruction (cf. Col. i. 13; Eph. ii. 2).

By the time of Christ, Jewish thought in certain circles had come sadly to reflect that, however 'good' the world may have been when God looked on it at its creation, it had somehow come under the control of various 'principalities' and 'powers'; but a new age would assuredly dawn when all would be renewed in glory and goodness. Paul, however, was convinced that, as with the individual, so with the world—renewal could only come through redemption. There was much talk regarding 'the elements of creation' (τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, Gal. iv. 3, 9; Col. ii. 8, 20). At the time of writing Galatians Paul had been content to regard these elements as 'weak and beggarly' in the sense that they could not help us once we got beyond the 'childish' or 'slavish' stage of religion; but by the time of the Imprisonment Epistles he had come to recognise them as dangerous agencies from whose sway impotent man required to be delivered. Something of their dread power had been manifested when they had succeeded in crucifying the Lord of Glory (1 Cor. ii. 8); but now by His resurrection and ascension Christ had put them under His feet, and for man the victory over them, if not completed, was at least begun, and the issue was assured. This

thought, expressed in Eph. i. 21, cf. vi. 12, is also found in Phil. ii. 9 ff.

(*b*) Paul's formulation of thought along this line was dictated by the necessity of combating doctrines which he regarded as false or inadequate. In certain forms of Jewish teaching at this time room was found for the operation of various angelic powers who as intermediaries between the spiritual and the material world were regarded as agents of God in the work of creation. The danger which Paul saw in such teaching was that the honour given to these angelic beings might come in the end to detract from the uniqueness of Christ the Son; hence he developed the doctrine, which we have in Colossians, of Christ as the sole and all-sufficient agent of God in the work of creation. He says of Christ not merely that He is the likeness (εἰκών, an expression which also occurs in 2 Cor. iv. 4) of the unseen God, but that He is "born first before all the creation"; "by Him were all things created, things in heaven and on earth, things seen and unseen"; "all things were created by Him and for Him"; "He is prior to all, and all coheres in Him"; "He is the beginning, the first to be born from the dead"; "in Him the divine Fullness willed to settle without limit." We cannot here stay to trace all these varied conceptions to their sources. Partly owing to an influence derivable from Plato there were many parallels to these ideas in Hellenistic thought; but in Paul they are probably quite sufficiently explained by his Jewish inheritance and the influence of certain ways of thought in contemporary Judaism. Thus, to take one example, there is something very attractive in the suggestion put forward by Professor Burney in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, January 1926, that Paul is working out a commentary on the

opening words of Genesis, showing how ' the beginning ' there referred to is Christ, and how the Hebrew prepositional phrase generally rendered ' *in* the beginning ' might be interpreted to mean that not merely *in* Christ, but also *by* Him and *for* Him all things were created.

Further we may note that some of those Christological expressions have parallels in other Pauline letters written about this time ; *e.g.* 1 Cor. viii. 6 ; Rom. xi. 36.

(*c*) While Christ is regarded as God's supreme agent, He is also thought of as the beginning of a new creation in virtue of His being ' the first to be born from the dead ' (πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν). With this we may compare the very similar expression, πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, which, according to Acts (xxvi. 23), Paul used when, a few months after his Ephesian ministry was over, he made an *apologia* for his faith before Agrippa. Evidently Paul had come to attach a cosmical significance to Christ's resurrection no less than to His death (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 20–8). Here we may add the more general reflection that, though naturally Christ's resurrection had always been a dominating fact for Paul both in his personal religion and in his theological thinking, yet the epistles of this period, including the Imprisonment Epistles, show unmistakably that at this time Paul's soul was aflame with a sense of what the resurrection of Christ meant in the divine scheme of world redemption. Never had God so thoroughly revealed His marvellous power as when He had intervened to raise Christ from the dead (Eph. i. 19). Life for Paul now meant a ceaseless striving to know not merely the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, but also the power of His resurrection and in the end to attain, if may be, to the resurrection of the dead (Phil. iii. 10 f.). In part this glowing appreciation of the significance of the resurrection is a reproduction

of his own personal experience, at a time when, as he himself says (1 Cor. xv. 31), life was for him a case of 'dying daily,' and we know how, at the end of the Ephesian period, he experienced a supernatural deliverance which gave him the sense of having been 'raised from the dead' (2 Cor. i. 8 ff.). Another factor which may have influenced him was the activity of those who at this time were going about among his Christian converts, denying the fact of the resurrection or seeking to explain it away (1 Cor. xv. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 18).

From one point of view Paul gloried in Christ because in relation to the created world He was πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, *i.e.* 'born first before all the creation,' and all the pre-eminence and privileges of the first-born belonged to Him; but through His resurrection He acquired a still fuller significance; He was πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, 'the first to be born from the dead' (Col. i. 18), and as such He was 'the beginning' in a new sense, viz. the beginning of a new creation. Paul had already taught that what God valued above circumcision or uncircumcision was 'a new creation' (καινὴ κτίσις, Gal. vi. 15), and in 2 Cor. v. 17 he asserts that such a new creation is effected when a man is 'in Christ.' Thus he is led to think of Christ as bringing into being a new order of humanity seen in the redeemed fellowship of the Christian Church. As He was Himself 'the first to be born from the dead,' *i.e.* the first to rise from the dead into the fullness of new life, so too He is (1 Cor. xv. 20) ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, "the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep," and through Him we too may rise into newness of life. Christians are those who share Christ's risen life (Col. iii. 1).

(*d*) Thus we are led to Paul's doctrine of the Church. Carrying on the thought which had always lain near the

heart of Jewish religion, that throughout the ages God had been seeking to win a people to be His own possession (cf. the frequently expressed thought: "I will be their God and they shall be my people," Jer. xxxi. 33; Ezek. xxxvi. 28, etc.), Paul had come to realise, in view of the world's need for a Saviour, that the true people of God was the fellowship which Christ had redeemed; and in this connection we may recall the significant phrase which, building on Old Testament language, he used in his address to the Ephesian elders (Acts xx. 28), "the church of the Lord (*or*, of God) which He purchased with His own blood (*or*, the blood of His own)." But what constituted membership in this Ecclesia or People of God? At the Jerusalem Council Paul had won his case that the basis of membership was not to be found in circumcision or in the keeping of the Mosaic law; and now in the period of his Ephesian ministry he had to contend that just as little was the bond of union to be found in the common cultus provided by the Temple at Jerusalem. To him, as to Stephen, to Jesus, and to some of the Old Testament prophets, God's permanent dwelling could not be in a temple made with hands; rather, as being Himself spirit, He is seeking to put His spirit within men (cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 26), and so to establish His dwelling in men's hearts. But as Paul surveyed the triumphs of the gospel he saw how, through Christ, the spirit of God was actually creating for itself such a dwelling-place in the ever-expanding fellowship of the Christian Church. In this fellowship, which knew no limitation of place or nation, Jews and Gentiles were being brought together into a new unity, and so with Jesus Christ as the corner-stone there was gradually taking shape a new edifice, far more wonderful than the Temple on Mount Zion,

destined to be 'a sacred temple in the Lord,' 'a habitation for God in the spirit' (cf. especially Eph. ii. 11–22).

To Paul, therefore, the Jerusalem Temple, like many other things in the old dispensation, was merely 'a shadow of the things that were to be' (σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, Col. ii. 17); and though he expressed it differently, his thought on this matter was much the same as that of the seer in Rev. xxi. 3: "Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God." The occurrence of this teaching on the new temple in the Imprisonment Epistles is of special interest and significance if we associate those epistles with the period of Paul's ministry when controversy was acute regarding the relation of Christians to the Jerusalem Temple—when, on the one hand, any interference with the payment by Christians of the temple tax was construed as 'temple robbery,' and when, on the other, Paul sought to lead his Christian congregations to contribute (*e.g.* by the collection for the poor Christians in Judæa) for the support and extension of the true Christian temple, the Church.

A second metaphor employed in the Imprisonment Epistles to describe the Church is that of a 'body.' When, following up the question of Christ's relation to the created world, Paul comes in Col. i. to consider Christ's relation to the new creation, the Church, he says (ver. 18): "He is the head of the body, the church." Owing to the easy way in which to-day we use the word 'body' to describe, not merely an organism, but also an organisation (*e.g.* 'an official body,' 'the body politic'), we are apt to forget that Paul's use of the term was to a large extent metaphorical. As a new creation the

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY

Church was, in his eyes, like a body of which Christ was the head. It is a simple and natural extension of this metaphor when, in Eph. i. 22 f., he refers to the Church as Christ's body. And, just as the metaphor of the temple is paralleled in the Corinthian Epistles (1 Cor. iii. 16 ; 2 Cor. vi. 16), where, however, he speaks of individual Christians as the temple of God in the sense that they are a dwelling-place for God's spirit, so too in 1 Cor. xii. 27 he reminds his Corinthian Christians that they are Christ's body—not, however, as being collectively the trunk of which He is the head, but rather as being severally constituent parts of His body.

In a work such as the present it has not seemed necessary or desirable to deal at length with the theological conceptions of the Imprisonment Epistles, but in the above sketch we have sought to show in a general way that Paul's thought might well have reached such a stage of development by the time of his Ephesian ministry. In dismissing the subject we may permit ourselves some general reflections :

(*a*) The problem of the date of the Imprisonment Epistles is primarily an historical one, and in attempts to reach a solution of it theories of doctrinal development possess only secondary value.

(*b*) The theological issue relates especially to Colossians and Ephesians. But many of the conceptions about which difficulty is felt have parallels or affinities (i) in Philippians, for whose attribution to the Ephesian period the case is especially strong, and (ii) in other epistles which were written during or shortly after the Ephesian ministry. We have noted especially certain parallels in 1 Corinthians, which in our view was written a month or two before

the imprisonment (following the riot) during which Colossians was written.

(*c*) Many of Paul's theological conceptions in these letters are to be explained by reference to the historical developments of the period. This applies, of course, to his refutation of the Colossian heresy, where much that he says is influenced by the false teaching which he seeks to combat. But it is true also in a more general way. During the Ephesian ministry the triumphs of the gospel evoked from Judaism the bitterest opposition, and the factor which more than any other at this time determined the expression of the apostle's theology was the necessity of setting forth the new Judaism, *i.e.* Christianity, over against the old, and of showing how the old faith received its fulfilment in the far more wonderful truths of the new. We see this especially in Paul's doctrine of the Church. Paul's teaching on that subject becomes not less but more intelligible when viewed in relation to the events of the Ephesian period.

CHAPTER XI

WAS THE IMPRISONMENT BEFORE OR AFTER 1 CORINTHIANS?—THE HYPOTHESIS OF SEVERAL IMPRISONMENTS

We adopt it, then, as a working hypothesis that Paul's Imprisonment Epistles were written some time during his three years' stay in Ephesus at the beginning of his third missionary journey. The question now arises: Can we date the imprisonment more precisely? Was it early or late in the Ephesian period? In particular was it anterior to the writing of 1 Corinthians, or did it come later, a consequence of that hostility to which allusion is made in 1 Cor. xvi. 9, in which case the apostle's plans to leave some time after Pentecost may have been seriously interfered with? The possibility must also be recognised of there having been more than one imprisonment. Viewed from a literary angle, the problem concerns the date of the Imprisonment Epistles—are they earlier or later than 1 Corinthians? Or, on the hypothesis that there were more imprisonments than one, are some of the Epistles earlier and some later than 1 Corinthians?

To answer the above questions satisfactorily we should have to go carefully into various historical developments that fall within this period, and study the evidence of the epistles with minute care. At this stage I propose to select four pieces of evidence that seem to bear very directly on the case. To assess these at their true value, and to know what deductions may safely be drawn from them, is a matter of extreme delicacy

and difficulty: and at the outset it may be well to glance at each of them, and to see wherein the difficulty mainly lies.

(i) First of all there is the reference to 'fighting with beasts' in 1 Cor. xv. 32, which, with other evidence in this epistle, may be held to point to a crisis now in the past.

(ii) The evidence of 2 Corinthians, on the other hand, especially the early reference in i. 8 ff., is most naturally taken to argue a comparatively recent crisis. Have we here evidence of an imprisonment later than 1 Corinthians, later even, it would appear, than the apostle's 'sorrowful visit' to Corinth?

(iii) Next we have the movements of Timothy, which we have already discussed on pp. 77 ff. If Timothy has been sent off before 1 Corinthians was written, then Philippians, in which his dispatch is still only in prospect, belongs to an earlier date; in other words, the imprisonment during which Philippians was written is anterior to 1 Corinthians.

(iv) The Book of Acts, while it gives no hint of an imprisonment at Ephesus, describes at some length a riot which might have had serious consequences for the apostle; and though Luke's statements of time at this point are quite indefinite, he probably means us to infer (i) that Timothy had been dispatched to Macedonia *before* the riot (xix. 22); (ii) that it was soon *after* the riot that Paul left Ephesus for Macedonia (xx. 1). From (i) it would appear that Philippians, which represents Timothy's visit to Macedonia as still in the future, is earlier than the riot, and as Philippians was written from prison, this implies an imprisonment previous to the riot. A special problem arises under (ii), for, as is well known, Paul made *two* westerly journeys about

this time, one on the occasion of the so-called ' sorrowful visit ' to Corinth (with regard to which the question will arise whether Paul made this journey via Macedonia, see pp. 176 ff.), the other being the journey when Titus brought him news of the reception accorded to the ' sorrowful letter ' (2 Cor. vii. 5 f.). Acts tells us of only one such journey : was it the first or the second of these that followed so soon after the riot ?

We proceed, then, to examine each of these lines of evidence in turn.

i. *The Evidence of* 1 *Corinthians*

Here the crux undoubtedly is the question raised in xv. 32 : εἰ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ἐθηριομάχησα ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος ; " if after the manner of men I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what would be the advantage to me ? " In connection with this difficult and much debated sentence two questions arise which must be kept separate :

(*a*) Has Paul in mind a real conflict with wild beasts in the arena [1] ? Or is his language to a greater or less extent figurative—entirely figurative, if he is merely giving picturesque expression to some great spiritual conflict, like Christ's picture of His own temptations ; or partly so, if the wild beasts were men whose fury he actually encountered and found it almost more than human ?

(*b*) If he *is* referring to a real contest with wild beasts, is he thinking of an ordeal through which he has actually passed, or is he merely envisaging what had once

[1] The anterior question may even be raised whether contests with beasts in the arena, such as were indulged in at Rome, did take place at Ephesus.

presented itself as a dreadful possibility: "if I *had* fought . . ."?

Now with regard to (*a*) we must undoubtedly allow a large place to metaphor in the language of religious emotion. E.g. the 'fiery trial' to which reference is made in 1 Pet. iv. 12, does not, as many commentators have misguidedly imagined, imply a burning at the stake; and in particular the animal creation provides many a figure for the portrayal of the assaults of evil on the soul of man. Wild beasts figure prominently in apocalyptic imagery; some symbolic significance undoubtedly attaches to the *θηρία* with which Christ associated in the wilderness (Mark i. 13); and the Psalmist prays for deliverance from the lion's mouth (Psalm xxii. 21), a metaphor which is repeated, no doubt as a quotation, in 2 Tim. iv. 17. Finally the very verb we are now considering, *θηριομαχεῖν*, is used by Ignatius in a sentence which is certainly metaphorical.[1] But the symbolism which is natural in poetry or apocalypse cannot safely be read into a passage in an epistle where words naturally have their literal meaning unless a figurative one is clearly indicated or demanded by the context; while, as regards the passage in Ignatius, readers could have had no doubt of the meaning, the metaphor being understandable just because it pointed forward to that other *θηριομαχία* which they knew awaited the aged bishop in the arena in Rome.

The case is different in the Pauline passage. So vivid a metaphor would scarcely have been introduced in this sudden way without some attempt being made to safeguard it from misunderstanding; and it is more

[1] ἀπὸ Συρίας μέχρι Ῥώμης θηριομαχῶ διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας δεδέμενος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, ὅ ἐστιν στρατιωτικὸν τάγμα (*Ep. ad Rom.* v. 1).

than doubtful if the debatable phrase *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον* provides such a safeguard. Further, the immediate context of the verse rules out any merely metaphorical interpretation. One cannot miss the gradations in thought implied in the successive phrases : " in danger every hour," " living always at death's door," " flung to the wild beasts in the arena." What a hopeless anticlimax in such a connection would be a reference to anything short of exposure to a cruel and bloody death ! And not only an anticlimax ; it would have been an irrelevance. For it is not merely the two immediately preceding verses which lead up here to this thought of a martyr's death ; Paul's whole argument at this point is concerned with death, physical death, and the resurrection which for the Christian implies victory over death. In discussing the general question of death and resurrection the apostle has been led on to speak of the particular question of baptism for the dead. His own life, he goes on to say, is a daily dying ; and the one thing that makes such a life worth while is the certainty of a resurrection, with all that that implies. Then, going on to take the extreme case of a martyr's death in the arena, he asks : what possible inducement could there be for me to be ready to face such a fate except the sure and certain hope of a resurrection ?

Paul is therefore thinking undoubtedly of physical death. The question might still be raised whether the language is to be taken entirely literally, implying a judicial condemnation and a conflict in the arena, or whether the apostle is thinking rather of human violence such as that of a bloodthirsty mob. It is, however, very doubtful whether Paul would have used even a partial metaphor of this kind without indicating more clearly the sense in which he meant it to be understood

—though, on the other hand, we must remember that the Corinthians with their fuller knowledge of the situation would be far less liable than we to misunderstand such a figure of speech. In any case there must have been a serious danger that the cry of the mob might be confirmed by a judicial verdict. The difficulty of interpretation is not made any easier by the qualifying phrase *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*. The phrase, be it noted, goes clearly with *ἐθηριομάχησα* : it is therefore quite illegitimate to take it with the main verb, as *e.g.* Goodspeed does in his ' American Translation ' : " From the human point of view, what good is it to me that I have fought wild beasts here in Ephesus ? " Perhaps the best and simplest explanation of the phrase is to read it as a direct contrast to such a phrase as *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν Θεοῦ* (1 Tim. i. 1) ; its meaning would then be : ' if men had their way.' Paul seems still to hear ringing in his ears that bloodthirsty cry that he should be flung to the lions.

(*b*) But, though Paul's language here is not to be dismissed as entirely metaphorical, the fact remains that it is hypothetical : ' if I (had) fought ' ; and the question now arises how far the hypothesis has a basis in fact.

(1) Had Paul actually been forced to face the wild beasts, and then somehow been delivered, we should certainly have expected to hear more about it.[1] We have already referred (p. 69) to the evidence of Hippolytus and of Nicephorus Callisti ; but the story there referred to, though it goes back to the apocryphal Acts of Paul, may quite well be a legendary development of Paul's own phrase, influenced by the similar story

[1] There are various stories of condemned criminals being left untouched by the animals, and otherwise escaping with their lives ; but frequently, as in the case of Mariccus mentioned by Tacitus (*Hist.* ii. 61) and the Egyptian martyrs (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* viii. 7) these were then dispatched by the sword of the executioner.

of the deliverance of Paul's disciple Thekla. Apart from this one hypothetical reference, there is nothing in Paul's own writings to suggest that he had ever been brought to face such an ordeal. The reference to 'the lion's mouth' in 2 Tim. iv. 17 is a quotation from the Psalms. In 1 Cor. iv. 11 ff., 2 Cor. vi. 4 ff., xi. 23 ff., he gives various catalogues of his sufferings, but in none of these is there a reference to *θηριομαχία*. In 1 Cor. iv. 9 the reference to the *θέατρον* is of course figurative, the 'condemned gladiators' are clearly introduced as a simile (*ὡς ἐπιθανατίους*), and though both these references, together with that in ver. 13 to 'the scum of the earth, the very refuse of the world' would have special significance if we otherwise knew that Paul had been condemned to the arena, they do not necessarily imply any such fate.

(2) Nor are we concerned to maintain that Paul had actually been condemned to the arena, but had in the end been spared from appearing there. In serious cases even a Roman citizen might be so condemned, and was liable thereby to lose his citizenship,[1]—which Paul clearly did not do, else he could not later have appealed to Cæsar. Further, if Paul had so thoroughly come under the power of the law as to be condemned to such a fate, even though he received some sort of reprieve we can scarcely imagine his recovering so soon complete liberty of action in the prosecution of his missionary work.

To sum up, therefore, our evidence with regard to the meaning of 1 Cor. xv. 32, we may say that, while it points to a crisis during which a violent outcry was raised that Paul should be condemned to the arena, the apostle was nevertheless spared from the fate to which his antagonists in their fury would have consigned him.

[1] Digest xxviii. 1, 8, 4.

The evidence is not indeed conclusive that along with the outcry went arrest and imprisonment, but the language of the apostle, with its indication of deadly peril, would miss much of its point if we had merely to reckon with a popular clamour which at no stage had been accompanied by official action. How the apostle came to escape we do not know—it may have been by an appeal to his Roman citizenship ; or was it that the Roman authorities came to see clearly that there was no real case against him ?

ii. *The Evidence of* 2 *Corinthians*

We turn to 2 Corinthians ; what light do we get here on the question whether Paul's imprisonment at Ephesus came before or after the writing of 1 Corinthians ?

One of the key-notes of this letter is θλίψις, ' affliction.' The opening sentences immediately after the salutation abound in references to θλίψις and παθήματα, and though Paul here uses the plural ' our affliction,' ' our sufferings,' still the context, with its contrast between ' we ' and ' you,' makes it clear that the reference is not to Christians in general, and that Paul is thinking in particular of the sufferings which he himself, in company perhaps with his missionary colleagues, is being called on to face. One very special experience he proceeds at once to refer to, the distressful experience which he had undergone in Asia when, as he says, he felt himself so utterly crushed that he despaired of life and in his own soul felt as if sentence of death had been passed on him. There is no gainsaying the life-and-death character of this experience. He speaks of being delivered from a terrible death, and so fully had he given himself up for lost that he pictures his deliverance as a resurrection :

the God who saved him was the God who raises the dead.

The nature of this crisis is not defined in the epistle —from which we may infer that the Corinthians knew quite well what he was referring to (he uses in ver. 8 the definite article '*the* distress'), though apparently there are certain implications of the experience which he wishes to bring home to them. In his account of it Paul uses throughout the plural 'we'; and though this does not necessarily imply that others besides himself were concerned, it points to some attack on the Christian movement or its representatives (cf. too the use of ἐβαρήθημεν, 'were crushed,' in ver. 8) rather than to some more personal danger such as illness. On the other hand, one notes that Ephesus is not specified in connection with the episode: we only know that it took place in Asia, of which Ephesus was the capital. Nothing too is said that points necessarily to imprisonment: θλίψις is a perfectly general term, and even in what he says about the 'sentence of death' which he passed upon himself Paul is thinking by comparison not so much of some Roman official whose verdict he had inwardly anticipated as of the divine Over-ruler who had planned for him a deliverance at a time when he himself was resigned to die.

But though the passage contains no specific reference to imprisonment, it is difficult not to believe that the death which threatened him was designed by his enemies, and imprisonment would seem almost to be implied. The question therefore naturally arises: Can Paul here be thinking of the terrible experience to which he refers in 1 Cor. xv. 32, when there seemed a possibility of his being flung to the lions? To this identification there are, however, two serious objections:

(1) Paul's language here seems to imply a comparatively recent experience, whereas several months (perhaps even a year) have now elapsed since that earlier crisis ; and we must not forget too, how since then the apostle has visited the Corinthians (the ' sorrowful visit ') and has therefore had an opportunity of telling them all about it.

(2) Paul's language here glows with a sense of supernatural deliverance which has no parallel in 1 Corinthians.

To estimate these objections at their true value let us look at the content of the passage under discussion. To appreciate all that is implied in those opening verses of the epistle is certainly not easy for us to-day, and the difficulty is increased by the uncertainty of the text in ver. 6. It is plain, however, that the information given in vers. 8 f. is not given solely, or even primarily, for information's sake. Paul rather seeks to give expression to certain religious convictions which, as he starts to write, are uppermost in his mind, viz. that in the experience of the Christian there is an intimate connection between suffering, consolation, and deliverance, and that the sufferings of the Christian, like those of Christ Himself, may be a means of bringing comfort and salvation to others. It is in confirmation of this Christian conviction that the apostle appeals to his own experience. Never can he forget that time in Asia when, humanly speaking, he recognised that his end had come ; yet God delivered him, raising him as it were from the dead. " And this experience " (so his argument runs), " is not something which I can view in isolation ; it colours my whole outlook on life ; for I recognise that a God who has so dealt with me once is essentially a God of comfort and a God of salvation, and He who delivered me then will deliver me still."

When we come to ask ourselves why Paul's thoughts are so full of this wonderful experience now, as he sits down to dictate a letter to the Corinthians, and why he is so eager to open his soul to them on the matter, a fact which ought not to be lost sight of in any attempt at explanation is that *in his relations with the Corinthians* Paul has recently passed through a time of great distress, and even with regard to this he has been privileged in a remarkable way to know the divine comfort. The distress had come to a head during the recent sorrowful visit (the Corinthians knew how deeply it had affected him then); it had continued with him after he left; and in ii. 12, 13 he tells how on his arrival at Troas his spirit could still find no rest. But when in vii. 4 ff. he continues the picture, telling of the fightings that surrounded him without and the fears that surged within, he goes on to relate how all this θλίψις was succeeded by the divine παράκλησις (both these nouns with their corresponding verbs occur here as in ch. i), " for He who comforts those who are brought low comforted me when Titus arrived with the good news which he brought me about you."

In writing therefore as he does at the beginning of his epistle, telling of that never-to-be-forgotten ' affliction ' which had overtaken him in Asia, and of the supernatural comfort and deliverance which he had experienced on that occasion, Paul is hoping no doubt to lead the Corinthians to a genuinely Christian appreciation of the ' affliction ' which he has experienced in his relations with *them* and of the ' comfort ' with which he has since been cheered. Paul himself is sustained with the religious assurance, which he would like the Corinthians to share with him, that the blessing of God is with him, and that, however many trials he may be called on to face, God will

save him out of them all. But apart from sharing his religious convictions he would like the Corinthians to be bound to him with the ties of sympathetic interest and understanding, and so he invokes their prayers, desiring them specially to give thanks to God for the great deliverance he has already experienced, and implying that in any future trial he would like to know that they are co-operating with him and helping him to meet it.

All this is no doubt true so far as it goes : Paul refers at the outset to the distress and the deliverance which he had experienced in Asia because he wishes the Corinthians to understand aright the distress and the consolation which he had in his relations with them. And if we were quite sure that the Asian distress belonged to the period before 1 Corinthians, we might seek in some such way to explain why Paul here, at the very opening of his epistle, unbosoms himself with regard to an experience which is no longer recent : he wishes his readers to appreciate how profoundly it had affected his whole subsequent outlook on life, and in particular had led him, amid all the trials that beset him in his missionary activity, to look with assurance to God for comfort and support. But though some such motive almost certainly underlies Paul's introduction of the subject (for it is not introduced *merely* as a piece of information), still I find it hard to believe that the crisis in question goes back to so early a period. Here the vital argument, to my mind, is the essential difference of atmosphere between 1 and 2 Corinthians in regard to this question of θλίψις. In 1 Corinthians the apostle represents himself as exposed day by day to hostility and persecution, but not a word in it suggests that he had recently experienced an unforgettable deliverance ; whereas when we come to 2 Corin-

thians this double note of extreme crisis and supernatural deliverance is sounded not merely in the opening verses but again and again throughout the epistle (cf. especially iv. 7–14, vi. 9).

But in seeking to date the 'affliction' of 2 Corinthians it is not enough to say that it was later than the crisis hinted at in 1 Corinthians. Despite all that we have said above regarding the religious lesson which Paul draws for himself, and wishes the Corinthians to draw with him, from the experience to which he refers, part at least of his motive in referring to it is to convey information; and though the phrase '*the* affliction' suggests that the Corinthians have heard something of the matter, the apostle shows himself desirous at the opening of the epistle to supplement their vague news by a personal testimony. But since 1 Corinthians was written, Paul had himself visited Corinth, on the occasion of the 'sorrowful visit.' Much regarding that visit is obscure, and during it Paul may have had little opportunity of enlightening the Corinthians with regard to his recent experiences in Asia; but his manner of introducing the subject in ver. 8 scarcely allows us to doubt that here he alludes to something which has happened to him subsequently to his last meeting with them, and about which he has had no previous opportunity of informing them. The crisis therefore of 2 Corinthians is not merely subsequent to the writing of 1 Corinthians; it is subsequent also to the 'sorrowful visit' to Corinth.

As to the scene of this terrible experience, 2 Cor. i. 8 says merely that it took place in Asia. In Chapter XIV we shall seek to show that the scene was not Ephesus, but an outlying part of the province, possibly Laodicea.

iii. *The Evidence afforded by the Movements of Timothy*

Support for the view that Paul suffered an imprisonment anterior to the writing of 1 Corinthians would seem to be forthcoming from a consideration of the movements of Timothy at this time. We have already seen (pp. 78 f.) how Philippians, written from prison, refers hopefully to an early visit to be paid by Timothy to Philippi; and it is natural to believe that this visit, if it ever was paid, is to be identified with the visit referred to in Acts xix. 22 and connected with the projected visit to Corinth referred to in 1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10. But the evidence of 1 Corinthians may with good reason be held to indicate that when that letter was written Timothy had already set out. In the first place, the absence of Timothy's name from the opening salutation suggests that Timothy, who had worked with Paul and Silas in Corinth (Acts xviii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 19) cannot have been with Paul when 1 Corinthians was written. He has, we may conclude, been sent off somewhere—not necessarily of course to Corinth or Macedonia; he may, as has been conjectured, have gone off to his native Galatia. That he has, however, been sent *westwards* is made probable by the way in which his proposed visit to Corinth is referred to in 1 Corinthians: ἔπεμψα *Τιμόθεον* in iv. 17 can scarcely be taken to imply a plan for a journey that is still entirely in the future; for this (as in Phil. ii. 19, 23) ἐλπίζω πέμψαι, 'I hope to send,' would be a more natural phrase. ἔπεμψα must refer to a journey which has either been begun already or is on the point of being begun now; and the latter is made improbable here by the other indications in the letter that Timothy is not now with the apostle. Further, this journey to Corinth, already entered on, was apparently not one which was to be

accomplished directly. The hypothetical 'if Timothy should come' in xvi. 10 may be taken to indicate both that the letter is to arrive before him, and that the question of his arrival is in some way dependent on the development of circumstances in the intervening period.[1] It is only natural therefore to assume (following what we otherwise know from Acts) that Timothy's westward journey, on which he had already set out, was to be made via Macedonia. And so, gathering up these various pieces of evidence, we conclude that Philippians, in which this visit of Timothy's is still something that is looked forward to, is earlier than 1 Corinthians, which indicates that Timothy had already set out.

It is hard to escape from the above conclusion. If, moved by the evidence of 2 Corinthians, we postulate an imprisonment subsequent to 1 Corinthians, and assign to that imprisonment the writing of Philippians, there are various ways in which we might try to overcome the difficulty with regard to Timothy's movements. We might, for instance, following the evidence of Acts and 1 Corinthians, postulate an earlier visit to Macedonia quite distinct from the one which is projected in Phil. ii. 19: the silence of Philippians, it might be held, is no conclusive argument against such a visit, and we could imagine how, despite the pious hope of Phil. ii. 24, the crisis at Ephesus had so altered his plans that, unable now to visit Macedonia in person as early as he had hoped to do, the apostle deemed it advisable (shall we say in view of Jewish machinations there? iii. 2 ff.) to send Timothy afresh as a deputy. Or, in opposition to the view main-

[1] In the closing words of the preceding verse, xvi. 9, Paul has referred to the 'many adversaries' that there are at Ephesus. May we link up the thought of these two verses and say that Paul even now foresees that opposition at Ephesus may develop in a way which will necessitate Timothy's recall?

tained above regarding the evidence of 1 Corinthians, it might be held that nothing there proves *conclusively* that in journeying to Corinth Timothy proceeded via Macedonia or indeed that he had already set out for the west at all. But neither of these reconstructions is in the least convincing, and we are driven back to the position that the imprisonment during which Philippians was written is anterior to 1 Corinthians.

iv. *The Evidence of Acts*

We have already noted that Luke's narrative of the early period of the Ephesian ministry leaves much to be desired, but in dealing with events at the time of the riot he writes with intimate knowledge. Here his careful narrative suggests that Timothy and Erastus had been dispatched to the west shortly before the riot occurred, and the absence of any further reference to Timothy at this point may be taken to indicate that he was not present during that disturbance. The riot is therefore later than the imprisonment in the course of which Philippians was written, for Timothy was then with the apostle. Acts would lead us to believe that the riot occurred towards the end of the apostle's residence in Ephesus; for before it broke out Paul was already planning an advance to Macedonia and Achaia (xix. 21), and he embarked on that journey shortly after the trouble was over (xx. 1).

With regard to a more precise dating of the riot, we may say that it probably occurred after the writing of 1 Corinthians. That letter would seem to have been written in the early spring, shortly after Timothy's departure (he would not leave till the winter was over), and at a time when the apostle visualised the possibility

of his leaving Ephesus about Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8). It is tempting to believe that the outburst may have been connected with the celebration of the great Ephesian festival of the Artemisia, which took place in March or April.

Before we turn from the evidence of Acts we may note that there occurred about this time an episode to which we had occasion to refer in our discussion of the evidence of 2 Corinthians, viz. the so-called 'sorrowful visit' of the apostle to Corinth. Acts passes over that visit in silence; for, attended though it was by far-reaching consequences for the apostle's relations with his Corinthian congregation, it was from the historian's point of view a mere episode in the story of Paul's missionary advance. There has been much discussion regarding the precise occasion of this visit; and in Chapter XIII we shall urge, contrary to the commonly accepted view, that it took place on the conclusion of the Ephesian ministry, and that Paul embarked on it after having reached Troas during his advance towards Macedonia. If this is so, the riot took place *before* the 'sorrowful visit' to Corinth; and we must carefully distinguish it from the trouble in Asia referred to in 2 Cor. i. 8, which apparently took place (during a subsequent and perhaps unexpected visit to Asia) *after* the 'sorrowful visit' to Corinth.

v. *Summary*

We proceed to sum up the conclusions we have reached in the preceding sections. 1 Corinthians and Philippians point to a crisis at Ephesus anterior to the writing of 1 Corinthians. On the other hand, the θλίψις of 2 Corinthians and the riot of Acts take us into the period between 1 and 2 Corinthians; but these two episodes

are not to be identified with one another, for the former took place after, and the latter before, the sorrowful visit to Corinth. Apparently, therefore, we have to reckon with three outbreaks of hostility. Apart from the evidence of the Imprisonment Epistles not one of these outbreaks has in the present chapter been shown *conclusively* to have been accompanied by imprisonment. Yet there must have been one or more imprisonments if the Epistles are to be assigned to this period.

This word 'imprisonment' has for many of us a misleading connotation: it suggests rigorous confinement in a dungeon, with the powers of the law ready to do their worst to the poor victim. It was not so that Paul was treated as a prisoner in Rome, where, though he had a soldier to guard him and was in some way chained (Acts xxviii. 16, 20), he still lived in a private lodging with full freedom to welcome visitors. A similar form of *libera custodia* would no doubt have been accorded to him by the Roman authorities in Asia. The phrases with which (in the Imprisonment Epistles) he describes his confinement do not in themselves imply anything more rigorous.[1]

Now it is plain that, when Paul's enemies were successful in working up a serious charge against him, the Roman authorities were bound to take action; and even in a case like the Demetrius riot, where some of those who were in responsible positions showed how lightly they regarded the charge that was brought against him, it is probable that, as a means of precaution and as a sop to the angry passions of his accusers, Paul would

[1] He speaks of 'my bonds' in Phil. i. 7, 13, 14, 17; Col. iv. 18; Philem. 10, 13. Similarly the adjective δέσμιος is used in Philem. 1, 9, and the verb δέδεμαι in Col. iv. 3. Twice he refers to ὁ συναιχμάλωτός μου (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 23); and in Col. i. 24 he speaks generally of his 'sufferings' (ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν).

be kept for a time under arrest. There were no doubt occasions when the imprisonment was more strict than at others, and the danger threatening the apostle more grave; but, if the authorities cared so to interpret it, the arrest might on other occasions mean little more than that he was kept under police supervision, and that he was temporarily deprived of full liberty of action, which in his case meant that restrictions were placed on his missionary activity. Nothing more serious need lie behind his words in Colossians (iv. 3), "Pray for me that God may give me an opening for the Word, to speak of the open secret of Christ for which I am in custody," or in Ephesians (vi. 19), "that I may be allowed to speak and open my lips in order to expound fully and freely that open secret of the gospel for the sake of which I am in custody as its envoy" (Moffatt).

From a study of references in his own correspondence (pp. 66 ff.) we have shown reason to believe that Paul endured at least one imprisonment (Rom. xvi. 7), and probably more than one (2 Cor. xi. 23), at this period; and the general probability of this is borne out by what we have learned of the violent and relentless opposition with which Paul was pursued at this time. And with regard to the three outbreaks of hostility which we have traced in the earlier sections of this chapter, we may summarise our conclusions as follows:

(1) The first was certainly followed by imprisonment if, as we have reason to believe, Philippians was written at that time.

(2) With regard to the second outbreak, some form of police supervision would probably have followed so serious a disturbance as the Demetrius riot, but so far we have found no clear proof of that. The problem of an imprisonment in this case is bound up, the present

writer believes, with the question of the date of Colossians and Philemon.

(3) As regards the third outbreak, the language in which the apostle describes in 2 Corinthians how seriously his life was threatened makes the hypothesis of imprisonment at least probable ; and the probability becomes a certainty if, as we believe (pp. 193 ff.), 2 Tim. iv. 16, in which the apostle alludes to his ' defence,' has reference to the same critical experience.

CHAPTER XII

THE ORDER AND HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE VARIOUS IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES

In the preceding chapter we have found reason to believe that during his missionary work in Asia Paul was subjected to at least two, and it may be three, violent outbreaks of hostility, accompanied possibly by imprisonment. On this hypothesis we have now to ask ourselves to which of those occasions does each of the Imprisonment Epistles belong. The evidence of Timothy's movements has led us to assign Philippians to the first of the outbreaks; but if this reconstruction is correct we shall expect to find it corroborated by other evidence. Ephesians raises special problems, and for the present we may leave it out of consideration—if (as I believe) it is authentic, it is to be taken closely with Colossians. Philemon and Colossians, too, are clearly to be taken together—both letters are going to Colossæ, as we can see from the reference in each to Archippus (Col. iv. 17; Philem. 2), and from the description of Onesimus, Philemon's runaway slave, in Col. iv. 9 as 'one of yourselves'; both refer to Onesimus's return in a way that shows clearly that he accompanies the bearer of the two letters; and the friends who send greetings (Epaphras, Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, and Luke) are the same in the two cases.[1] Our main problem therefore concerns the relative order of Colossians (with Philemon) and

[1] In Col. iv. 11 greetings are also sent from 'Jesus, surnamed Justus'; and the attractive suggestion has been made that

Philippians; and if we should decide that Colossians is later than Philippians, we shall have to consider to which of the three hostile periods it is to be assigned.

i. *Colossians Written before the Third Crisis*

A careful study of the whole situation has led the present writer to believe that Colossians (and Philemon) cannot be assigned to the third period of hostility, of which we have evidence in 2 Corinthians, and which came, as we have urged, after the sorrowful visit to Corinth. The following reasons have contributed to this conclusion.

(*a*) Though the apostle *did* on the conclusion of the sorrowful visit return to Asia and there experienced that signal danger and deliverance of which he afterwards tells the Corinthians, this was not in accordance with his plan of campaign at the time of setting out. This whole problem will be discussed in Chapter XIII, where we shall show that, when he left Ephesus, he definitely regarded his ministry in Ephesus and neighbourhood as ended. It is difficult to believe that he would have left Ephesus at that time without having first visited the church in Colossæ and Laodicea (cf. the deep concern expressed in Col. ii. 1, and evidenced by his request for a lodging in Philem. 22), but we know from Colossians that he had not visited them before he wrote that letter.

(*b*) In 2 Tim. iv. 9 ff. we have part of a letter, undoubtedly genuine, which the present writer believes (p. 191) was written during the third outbreak of hostility

owing to the occurrence of the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ his name has dropped out of the text of Philem. 23 f., either by haplography or by the substitution of Ἰησοῦ for the original Ἰησοῦς.

in Asia (cf. the reference to the ' defence ' in ver. 16). But, as we shall show (pp. 195 ff.), a detailed study of the references in that letter reveals a situation which is later in date than Colossians.

(*c*) The general situation of the apostle at the time of writing Colossians points in the same direction (on this see pp. 157–161). There is nothing in Colossians or Philemon of that tense emotion, that realisation of a divine deliverance from the very jaws of death, which finds expression in the apostle's references in 2 Cor. i. 8 ff. and 2 Tim. iv. 17 f.

ii. *Paul's Associates at the Time of Writing the Various Epistles*

Some light on the relative order of the epistles may be gained if we note who are the companions who in each are mentioned as being present with the apostle.

Before coming to details on this matter, let us begin with a general view of the two situations—that in Colossians (with Philemon) and that in Philippians. So far as the presence of companions is concerned, it looks as if we must recognise a radical difference in these situations : in the former case (as the greetings show) Paul has many friends beside him, while in Philippians none of these is mentioned by name, and when the question is raised about the dispatch of an envoy Paul writes rather sadly that, apart from Timothy, there is no suitable person whom he can send (Phil. ii. 19 ff.). Thus, even on a general view of the case we may well question whether the two situations can fall within the same imprisonment period.

It is true that the difference in the two situations can

easily be exaggerated. (*a*) That Paul is not alone when Philippians was written is shown by the phrase 'the brethren who are with me' in iv. 21; and if these are not specified it is probably because they were not known by name to the Christians in Philippi. (*b*) The mention of these brethren shows too that it is possible to interpret too literally the reference to 'everyone' as being selfish in ii. 21. The description of Timothy in the preceding verse is meant to imply, not that Timothy is the only person who is unselfish enough to be interested in the Philippians, but that in sending Timothy Paul is selecting one who, to an extent with which others cannot compare, has knowledge of and sympathy with the Philippian situation. The people from whom greetings are sent in Colossians and Philemon would probably be known by name to the Colossian Christians, and would not necessarily be in Paul's mind when he was thinking of a suitable deputy to send to Philippi. For when Paul sent a deputy to one of his churches, it meant that there was some difficult situation to be explored, some serious business to be transacted, and for that reason the deputy sent required to be one whose qualifications corresponded to the needs of the situation. In general, too, he would be a man who was already known to the church to which he was sent. Thus we need feel no surprise that no mention is made in Philippians of Epaphras, who is apparently a Colossian (cf. 'one of yourselves,' Col. iv. 12), or of Jesus Justus, of whom we know nothing except that he was a Jewish-Christian (Col. iv. 11). (*c*) We must not forget that Paul's companions were often sent off on special missions: thus, if for the moment we cared to assume that Colossians was earlier, we could understand that Tychicus, Onesimus, and Mark had all left according to arrangement before Philippians was

written. Not, we may add, that the absence of their names in the Philippian epistle is necessarily to be accounted for in that way : none of them, so far as our information goes, was known to the Philippians, and the absence of a reference to them is sufficiently explained by that fact.

But when every allowance has been made, a more detailed survey of the two situations reveals peculiarities sufficiently remarkable to render it unlikely that we are dealing in each case with the same imprisonment period. This, however, does not mean that only one of the two situations belongs to Ephesus, for we have already seen good reason to believe that during the Ephesian ministry there were two or more imprisonments. May it therefore be that Colossians, with Philemon, belongs to one imprisonment, and Philippians to another ?

We turn, then, to make that more detailed survey of which we have just spoken. In the main we shall proceed on the assumption that the Imprisonment Epistles all belong to the Ephesian period, and we shall find that there is a strong case for assigning Philippians to an earlier imprisonment and Colossians, with Philemon, to a later one ; but we shall note as we go along any evidence that seems to tell against our reconstruction—either against the distribution of the various letters between two different imprisonments in Ephesus, or (it may be) against assigning them to Ephesus at all.

Our concern here is to trace in greater detail the movements of some of Paul's companions at this time.

(1) Aristarchus

Acts xix. 29 tells us that Aristarchus was with Paul at the time of the Ephesian riot, and that the mob laid

forcible hands on him. He is also with Paul when Colossians and Philemon are written, and in Col. iv. 10 he is even described as a 'fellow prisoner.'[1] Taken together, these two pieces of evidence regarding Aristarchus yield some evidence for the belief that Colossians was written from an imprisonment following the Demetrius riot.

But while he is with Paul when Colossians and Philemon were written, Aristarchus is not mentioned in the letter to the Philippians. This is especially noteworthy in view of the fact, vouched for in Acts (xix. 29 ; xx. 4 ; xxvii. 2), that he was a Macedonian from Thessalonica. The absence of his name from the list of greetings, together with the apostle's declaration in Phil. ii. 20 ff. that, apart from Timothy, he has no suitable envoy to send to Philippi, affords fair ground for believing that at the time when Philippians was written Aristarchus was not present with Paul.

From this survey of Aristarchus's movements certain significant results emerge, and certain interesting hypotheses suggest themselves.

(*a*) We have noted that while Aristarchus was with Paul at the time of the riot, he was probably not with him at the time when Philippians was written. That fact tends to show that the imprisonment during which Philippians was written does not belong to the same period as the riot. But we have already seen reason to

[1] We can scarcely dismiss this designation as entirely metaphorical, referring to 'spiritual captivity' (Lightfoot, *ad loc.*). One may note, however, that Aristarchus is not so described in Philemon, where he is merely one of Paul's 'fellow workers,' also that the designation 'fellow prisoner' is there applied to Epaphras, who in Colossians (i. 7, cf. iv. 12) is described simply as a 'fellow servant.' This of course does not necessarily imply that the man who is a prisoner in the one letter is a free man in the other.

believe that Philippians was written at a relatively early stage in the Ephesian period (before 1 Corinthians) and that the riot came after 1 Corinthians. Does Philippians therefore belong to the earlier imprisonment and Colossians to the later?

(*b*) Aristarchus is later with Paul when the apostle, leaving Corinth, goes on to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4); but what of his movements in the intermediate period? Here we may note that he is not mentioned, at least by name, in either of the Corinthian epistles (though it might be said that there was no occasion to mention his name there) nor in the fragment 2 Tim. iv. 9 ff., which we are to see was probably written in Asia after Paul returned from the 'sorrowful visit' to Corinth. But if he was with Paul at the time of the riot and the accompanying imprisonment (which belongs, it would appear, to the concluding period of Paul's residence in Ephesus) and again on the occasion of the final visit to Corinth, is it not probable, especially in view of his Macedonian origin, that he accompanied Paul on the intermediate journey through Macedonia? I venture to suggest that he did so, and that, though not mentioned by name, he is to be identified with one of the brethren whom Paul says in 2 Cor. viii. 18 ff. that he is sending to Corinth to supervise the collection scheme. We may note that the term *συνέκδημος* applied to the financial delegate in 2 Cor. viii. 19 is used to describe Aristarchus[1] and Gaius in Acts xix. 29. Little stress, however, need be attached to this, for the term contains no necessary reference to financial work; it denotes merely one who travelled about with the apostle and was associated with him in his missionary work.

[1] For Aristarchus's possible connection with the collection scheme see pp. 240 ff.

(*c*) Can we say anything about Aristarchus's movements previous to the riot, or (to put otherwise what on our view is much the same thing) before he came to be with the apostle at the time when Colossians and Philemon were written? Had he been with Paul when Philippians was written, he would almost certainly, as a Macedonian,[1] have been mentioned in the letter, and Paul could scarcely have used such language about his own loneliness as he does in Phil. ii. 20 f.[2] Two possibilities therefore present themselves. May it be (*a*) that at the time when Philippians was written Aristarchus had been sent off on a special mission? The difficulty here is to imagine where he may have been sent to. A Macedonian was not a likely delegate to send to Galatia; and had he gone off to Macedonia Philippians would probably have had a reference to the fact. The alternative (*b*) is to say that when Philippians was written Aristarchus had not yet joined Paul. Of these two possibilities the latter seems to be by far the more probable, and it suggests certain further reflections.

(*d*) If we ask how it was that Aristarchus came to be with the apostle at all, a plausible conjecture is that, stirred (shall we say?) by what the Philippians had done through the agency of Epaphroditus, the Thessalonians had sent him to bear their greetings to the apostle and to stay on and render any assistance in his power, acting as

[1] It may be felt that this argument exaggerates the bond of sympathy between the churches of Thessalonica and Philippi. Probably this is not so; the apostle thought of the churches of Macedonia as forming a unity, as we see from the way he refers to them in 2 Corinthians, chapters viii. and ix.

[2] The same argument applies to Gaius if we accept the reading Μακεδόνας in Acts xix. 29. In view of Acts xx. 4, however, where a Gaius is mentioned who is a native of Derbe, the suggestion has been made that Μακεδόνας is an error by dittography for Μακεδόνα, which applies only to Aristarchus.

their ἀπόστολος καὶ λειτουργός (Phil. ii. 25; cf. also ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν used of the collection-delegates in 2 Cor. viii. 23) in the service of the gospel. It is plain that Paul sought to lay on his various churches the obligation of co-operating with him in the great work of missionary expansion; and while they might help by providing money, as apparently Philippi had done on several occasions, a closer link was forged when they sent one of their own number to join in the work. We ought probably to think of Epaphroditus, not merely as the bearer of the gift of the Philippians, but as their missionary, sent by them to be an assistant and travelling-companion to the great apostle. As it happened, illness robbed him of this notable privilege. But what was denied to Epaphroditus was granted to Aristarchus, who at a slightly later date came on a similar mission as a representative of the Thessalonians; for he was able to stay with the apostle in Ephesus, to accompany him to Macedonia and Corinth, to go up with him to Jerusalem and even to sail with him on the first part of the voyage that led to Rome.[1]

(*e*) This hypothesis that Aristarchus first joined Paul as a representative missionary from the Thessalonian church is not in the least incompatible with the fact that later his position with Paul seems to have been that of a delegate from the Macedonian churches commissioned to carry their collection-contribution to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4). Rather this latter fact adds cogency to our hypothesis. We shall later show reason to believe that at the time when he wrote Philippians Paul had not yet had an opportunity of laying the collection-scheme before

[1] We cannot say whether he accompanied Paul all the way to Rome. When Paul changed ships at Myra Aristarchus may have gone home to Macedonia (Acts xxvii. 2, 5 f.); cf. p. 90.

the churches of Macedonia (p. 238); but when finally he did secure their co-operation, who was more likely to be invited by them to be one of their collection-delegates than the Thessalonian who had for the last year or two been so closely associated with Paul as a missionary companion?

We have pursued some of these reflections regarding Aristarchus because of the light they shed on the general position; but the point which we are more particularly concerned to establish here is that it was after the writing of Philippians that Aristarchus came from Thessalonica to join Paul, and that his presence with the apostle when Colossians and Philemon were written is an indication that those letters belong to a rather later date than Philippians. Before we leave the matter, let us glance at the alternative proposition, viz. that Colossians and Philemon may be earlier than Philippians. On that view a possible explanation of Aristarchus's movements might be that he had gone off to Macedonia, perhaps to his native Thessalonica, and that there he awaited Paul. We might in that case be tempted to say that he had been sent ahead to interest the Macedonians in the work of the collection; but as against this hypothesis we shall see later (p. 239) that apparently Macedonia made little or no progress with the collection before Paul himself appeared. Besides, no matter whether written before or after Colossians, Philippians might be expected to have a reference to Aristarchus if by this time he had gone on to Macedonia.

The movements of Aristarchus may therefore be taken to indicate (*a*) that Philippians was written during the earlier Ephesian crisis, at a time when he himself was not with the apostle; and (*b*) that Colossians and Philemon belong to the later crisis.

(2) Demas

If 2 Tim. iv. 10 can be taken as evidence that Demas was, like Aristarchus, a Thessalonian, we have to note the fact that, like Aristarchus, he is not mentioned in Philippians. Here again, as in the case of Aristarchus, the reason almost certainly is, not that he had gone off somewhere, but that he had not yet joined Paul. Had he too been commissioned by the Thessalonian church to act as a representative missionary? If so, we see the Thessalonians, in conformity with the example of Jesus and with apostolic practice, sending forth *two* of their number on the work of evangelisation, and of these two one (Aristarchus) represented the Jewish-Christian section (Col. iv. 10 f.), the other (Demas) the Gentile-Christian section. Demas remained with Paul during the crisis of the riot and the imprisonment when Colossians and Philemon were written (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24); and in Chapter XIV we shall show reason to believe that he accompanied the apostle when the latter, having left Ephesus, set out to go to Macedonia, but deserted his master and returned direct to Thessalonica (2 Tim. iv. 10) when Paul decided (at Troas?) to postpone his advance to Macedonia and to proceed meantime to Corinth.

Thus the movements of Demas agree with the view that Philippians belongs to an earlier date than Colossians and Philemon.

(3) Luke

We have already referred (pp. 90 f.) to the problem of Luke's movements. Whatever his movements may have been subsequent to the time when (as is generally assumed from a study of the 'we'-passages in Acts)

he parted from the apostle at Philippi on the occasion of Paul's first coming to Europe, it would be only natural if he joined his master during part at least of the critical period in Ephesus ; and from the inclusion of his name in the list of those who send greetings we see that he was with Paul when Colossians and Philemon were written. The fact that he sends greetings probably implies that he had been in Ephesus for some time, knowing Philemon personally and having some sort of link with the Colossians (they had possibly heard of the apostle's ' beloved physician '). On the other hand, no mention of his name occurs in Philippians. This omission raises certain pertinent questions.

(*a*) Was Luke then with the apostle at Ephesus ? Then why is he not mentioned by name as sending greetings to the Philippians, whom, apparently, he knew so well ? Further, despite what we have said (p. 146) regarding the danger of reading too much into Paul's language in Phil. ii. 21, especially as Luke's relation to the apostle was perhaps that of doctor and secretary rather than that of a missionary-deputy, still Paul would probably have expressed himself differently if he had had with him at the time so good a friend of the Philippians as Luke. On the other hand (*b*), if Luke was still with the Philippians, we should have expected greetings to be sent *to* him. In the absence of fuller data we cannot dogmatise, but on the whole it looks as if, wherever else he may have been, Luke was not present with the apostle in Ephesus when Philippians was written.

With this we may connect the evidence of Acts. There is reason to think that the author wrote with first-hand knowledge regarding the concluding period of the Ephesian ministry, but was a mere retailer of

second-hand information with regard to the earlier period. And the point at which he begins to write with some grasp of detail (contrast the vague ὡς δὲ ἐπληρώθη ταῦτα with which he there sums up the preceding period) is where in xix. 21 he tells how Paul began to form plans for his western advance to Macedonia and Achaia, and how, while deciding to delay his own departure for a time, he sent ahead Timothy and Erastus as his deputies. But the reference to Timothy's departure for Macedonia shows that he is here dealing with a period immediately subsequent to the imprisonment during which Philippians (which referred to Timothy's departure as a future event) was written.

Thus from a study both of the Epistles and of Acts we are led to the conclusion that Luke, who was with his master when Colossians and Philemon were written, had not yet joined him when Philippians was written, and that while Philippians belongs to an earlier crisis, Colossians and Philemon are to be dated towards the end of the Ephesian ministry, during an imprisonment that followed the Demetrius riot.

(4) Aquila and Priscilla

These two faithful companions were with Paul when 1 Corinthians was written (1 Cor. xvi. 19), and probably were in Ephesus during most, if not all, of Paul's ministry there. It was at Ephesus, no doubt, that they risked their lives for the apostle (Rom. xvi. 3): but to which of the two crises, if to either, this refers we have at this stage of our inquiry no means of judging. That they are not mentioned in Philippians need not surprise us, for they were not known in Philippi, having gone from Rome to Corinth and thence to Ephesus. It is noteworthy, however, in view of the close relations which

the Colossian church had with Ephesus, that there are no greetings from them, as there are from so many others of the brethren, in Colossians or Philemon. Can they therefore have been absent from Ephesus at the time when those letters were sent? In this connection it is a matter of much significance that they are not mentioned in Acts in connection with the riot; yet had they been present on that occasion, it is probable, in view of their Jewish origin and their long association with the Christian movement in the city, that they would have been specially marked out for attack. Here then, in these two pieces of evidence pointing apparently to the absence of Aquila and Priscilla from the city, we have an argument, corroborating what we previously suggested (p. 149) on the basis of the references to Aristarchus's imprisonment (Acts xix. 29; Col. iv. 10), for associating the writing of Colossians and Philemon with the crisis of the Demetrius riot, which occurred late in the Ephesian period. And, to revert to a point mentioned above, their apparent absence at this later time makes it probable that the occasion when they risked their lives was during an earlier crisis—shall we say that with which we connect the writing of Philippians?

iii. *The Progress of the Christian Movement as seen in the Various Epistles*

In Col. iv. 3 the apostle solicits prayer that a door may be opened (*i.e.* in Ephesus, and in the province generally) for the preaching of the Word. Over against this we may set the picture given in Phil. i. 12 ff., which clearly shows that (again in Ephesus) a good deal of preaching is going on—so much of it, indeed, that despite

certain distressful features Paul's heart rejoices. Does not the latter, it may be asked, indicate a more advanced situation than the former? Even if we were sure that both epistles belonged to the same imprisonment, the argument would be a doubtful one, for there might be many preachers without their finding the 'open door' which Paul desiderated; and it loses all force once we admit that Colossians may belong to a later imprisonment than Philippians. The request for prayer in Col. iv. 3 is not in the least incompatible with the view that the success of an earlier period had been interrupted by a fresh outburst of hostility such as the Demetrius riot, and a fresh restriction on the apostle's missionary activity.

The prayer for an 'open door' in Colossians recalls further Paul's statement in 1 Cor. xvi. 8—"a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries." Here again it would be unsafe to argue that the exultant declaration in 1 Corinthians reflects a later situation than the prayer in Colossians. Paul's optimism, tempered as it is by the existence of serious opposition, is perfectly intelligible if, as we have shown, 1 Corinthians was preceded by a period of hostility and imprisonment which, after a time when the situation seemed serious, had ended in the apostle's acquittal. Besides, the fact that in the Colossians passage (cf. Eph. vi. 19 f.) the apostle definitely associates his bonds with the preaching of the gospel carries with it the implication that the 'door' is meanwhile shut and will require to be opened, no matter whether it has been previously opened or not.

All therefore that is implied in Col. iv. 3 is that the apostle has been put under some form of arrest, and that he sees to his regret the great work of evangelisation

interrupted. The general situation is such as might have followed the Demetrius riot. It is possible, as we have suggested, that that outburst of hostility was occasioned in part by the remarkable headway which the Christian movement was at this time making in Gentile circles, and we can imagine how the apostle was aglow with eagerness that the way might soon be open for him to push its conquests still further.

Our conclusion therefore under this section is that while the situation in 1 Corinthians reveals a period of missionary progress at Ephesus subsequent to an earlier crisis during which Philippians was written, there came a later imprisonment, indicated in Colossians and Philemon, when progress was temporarily interrupted.

iv. *The Conditions of the Apostle's Imprisonment as seen in the Various Epistles*

The situation of the apostle is clearly much more serious in Philippians than in Colossians and Philemon. In the former case he is living under the shadow of an approaching trial, and he recognises, not without some inward satisfaction, the possibility of a martyr's death (i. 20 ff., ii. 17). In Colossians and Philemon, however, there is no hint of imminent danger, nothing to indicate that soon the prisoner must answer to a capital charge. Rather is expression given to the hope of a release; and as the apostle hopes soon to visit Colossæ, Philemon is asked to arrange for a lodging. It is true that a similar hope of an early visit,[1] expressed with full religious

[1] From the two letters Colossians and Philippians it thus appears that Paul has in mind a visit (probably one of quite short duration, to churches which had not yet seen his face) eastwards to the Lycus valley, and also a journey westwards to Macedonia. Of this journey westwards we know much more: it was part of his great

assurance, is to be found in Phil. ii. 24 : " I am confident in the Lord that I shall myself come before long " ; but even this confidence cannot obscure for us the uncertainty with which the apostle views the issue of the proceedings against him. The very phrase ' in the Lord ' probably indicates that it is his religious faith alone which inspires this confidence—a confidence which, if regard were had merely to the hard facts of the situation, might otherwise seem baseless ; and this expression of optimism may be explained, in part at least, by the desire to hearten a community which is in danger of depression (cf. i. 24 f.).

If we were sure that all the epistles belonged to the same imprisonment period we might be inclined to argue from the above evidence that Philippians, with its frank recognition of what the trial may involve, is the latest of the group. But such a deduction is robbed of all cogency as soon as we admit the possibility that the letters may belong to two different imprisonments. All therefore that we may deduce from our evidence is that the conditions in the one case were much more serious than in the other : on the question which of the two situations was the earlier we learn nothing.

We may claim, however, that the picture given above of Paul's general situation in the two cases is in harmony with our hypothesis that his first imprisonment, during which he wrote Philippians, was a much more serious

scheme of advance through Greece to Rome, and clearly it would have been his intention to fit in his visit to Colossæ before leaving Asia for Europe. Whether the visit to Colossæ was ever paid is a matter on which we are not informed. It is extremely unlikely that Paul would have left Asia without visiting the churches in the Lycus valley ; and in Chapter XIV we shall show evidence for thinking that Paul may have visited them a second time after his ' sorrowful visit ' to Corinth.

affair than the second. In the former case, he had been accused of ἱεροσυλία, and so serious a charge brought him for a time face to face with death. In the latter case he probably suffered little more than a mild form of detention, during which he had no real danger to fear, and his chief regret was that he was deprived for a time of full liberty to preach the gospel (Col. iv. 3).

May we add that on this interpretation of the Colossians-Philemon imprisonment we can better understand how Paul was able to come into touch with Onesimus? (cf. Note, page 73). Had Paul been in close confinement, such a meeting could scarcely have been arranged. It was possible just because on this occasion Paul enjoyed the full privilege of *libera custodia*, free (as he was later in Rome, Acts xxviii. 30) to welcome any who came to visit him.

Part 3

PAUL'S MOVEMENTS FROM EPHESUS AS A BASE

CHAPTER XIII

PAUL'S JOURNEYS TO CORINTH

ACCORDING to Acts xx. 1–3, Paul, on the conclusion of his stay in Ephesus, proceeded through Macedonia to Greece, where, with his headquarters presumably at Corinth, he stayed three months. But it is generally recognised, on the basis of evidence in 2 Corinthians, that he had paid another visit to Corinth shortly before this —the so-called 'sorrowful visit.' For a reconstruction of the Ephesian period it becomes a matter of vital importance to place this 'sorrowful visit' in its proper setting. Stated briefly, the problem is this. The 'sorrowful visit' to Corinth has generally been represented as an interruption forced on the apostle in the course of his stay at Ephesus: it was from Ephesus that he went and to Ephesus that he returned. In the following pages the view will be maintained that the 'sorrowful visit,' while partaking of the nature of an interruption to the apostle's plans, came after the completion of the Ephesian ministry; and the question will be raised where he was when the necessity arose for an immediate visit to Corinth, and what was the place to which he returned after the visit was over.

i. *Paul's Plans for visiting Corinth* (1 *Cor.* xvi. 5 *ff.*; 2 *Cor.* i. 15 *ff.*)

While at Ephesus Paul was confronted with a succession of grave problems in the Corinthian church. 1 Corinthians gives us abundant evidence of this; and by the time

that 2 Corinthians was written the situation had become much more serious. At some time, obviously subsequent to the dispatch of 1 Corinthians, Paul had himself visited Corinth,[1] and the visit had been marred by an experience of so unpleasant a character that he had retired (apparently to Asia) pained and humiliated. Realising that his presence in Corinth was undesirable until the atmosphere had completely changed, he dispatched a letter written, he himself says, in tears (2 Cor. ii. 4). Titus, who may, or may not, have been the bearer of this letter, was commissioned to join the apostle with news of its reception ; and when in course of time Paul took his departure from Asia, making his way from Troas to Macedonia, it was with a heart that knew no peace until at last he met Titus (apparently somewhere in Macedonia) and learned from him that the ' sorrowful letter ' (as it is often called) had been received by the Corinthians in the right spirit and had produced the desired effect (2 Cor. vii. 5 ff.).

Paul recognises that the way is now open for his return to Corinth when he shall feel free to go ; other duties detain him for a time in Macedonia, but in the course of the next winter he arrives at Corinth, where he stays three months.[2]

Into the various causes of dispute between the apostle and the Corinthians it is not necessary for us here to enter. One factor, however, calls for special consideration, because it bears very definitely upon his movements.

[1] Attempts have been made to deny this visit, but there is no other satisfactory explanation of the language of 2 Cor. ii. 1, xii. 14, xiii. 1, 2.

[2] See Acts xx. 1–3. This brief *communiqué* contains all the information Acts has to give us of Paul's relations with Corinth after his first visit. Other data in Acts enable us to date Paul's arrival in Corinth somewhere about January : see p. 291.

In 1 Cor. xvi. 5 ff. (written, shall we say? early, some time before Pentecost, in the year of his leaving Ephesus: see vers. 8, 9) Paul tells his readers that some time after Pentecost he is to proceed via Macedonia to Corinth, where he hopes to spend some time, possibly even winter. Apparently he is not quite sure whether circumstances are to allow him to reach Corinth from Macedonia before the winter begins, or whether he will have to spend the winter *en route*, arriving in Corinth in the following spring.[1]

Here we have a hint of a situation which further evidence makes only too clear, that Paul at this time had the greatest uncertainty with regard to his future plans. What caused this uncertainty? One factor no doubt was the situation in Ephesus with all its opportunities, and its acute difficulties, to which he makes reference in 1 Cor. xvi. 9—a situation, we may note in passing, which fits in quite well with the view that the acute crisis of the imprisonment is past, and that there is now the possibility of active and successful propaganda work. But this is not the main factor. There is also the uncertainty with regard to the Jerusalem visit—whether (after Corinth) he himself is to go there, or whether he is to content himself with sending deputies (cf. vers. 3, 4 and 'whithersoever I go' in ver. 6). But we shall not be wrong if we regard Paul's *immediate* anxiety as caused mainly by the situation in Corinth. His relations with that church are even now none too happy. This is partly evidenced by the proposed visit of Timothy (1 Cor. iv. 17, xvi. 10 f., see pp. 137 f.). Still more significant is the warning issued in 1 Cor. iv. 18–21 to those who are taking advantage of his absence, "Shall I come to you with a rod of

[1] Paul's use of the verb διέρχομαι probably implies that he meant to do evangelistic work in Macedonia.

discipline?" Paul's language too, in 1 Cor. xvi. 7, "I do not wish to see you merely in passing," shows that he knows how careful he must be in his dealings with the Corinthians, who are no doubt jealous of the attention he is paying to other places—to Ephesus, and more especially to Macedonia.

We learn, however, from 2 Cor. i. 15 ff. (written at a later date, subsequent even to the sorrowful visit) that a different plan of travel had at some time been entertained,[1] viz. that the apostle should travel to Macedonia via Corinth, and then return to Corinth so as to sail from there to Judæa, along with the collection-delegates. In recent reconstructions of this period it has often been argued, or more generally assumed, that this plan was subsequent to, and a modification of, that propounded in 1 Cor. xvi. According to this view, the development of events was as follows:

(*a*) Paul intimated his intention of travelling via Macedonia, 1 Cor. xvi. We may call this Plan X.

(*b*) He later formed a new plan, viz. to visit Corinth direct, then go to Macedonia, then return from there to Corinth, 2 Cor. i. 15. ff. We call this Plan Y.

(*c*) At some time subsequent to (*a*), though whether before or after (*b*) we have no means of judging, Paul actually does visit Corinth (the sorrowful visit). This visit, however, is of the nature of an interpolation; it has no relation either to plan X, or, if that was already formed, to plan Y. This visit, being of an incidental character, is generally regarded as having been made by the direct sea-route, though let us note that there is no evidence for this.

(*d*) When finally Paul does make his promised visit

[1] On the question whether this plan had been announced to the Corinthians, see p. 174.

to Corinth, he does so (as we see from his meeting with Titus recorded in 2 Corinthians) through Macedonia.

Such a reconstruction is, however, exposed to certain very grave objections. According to this, Paul, having changed plan X to plan Y, does not in the end abide by the change, but falls back on his original intention of going first to Macedonia. Is this likely? We may note, too, how short is the time within which all these changes are made, if the original plan, which was subsequently changed twice, was first announced as recently as the writing of 1 Corinthians.

Why, then, should we not assume that the visit which ended so unhappily is in some way linked up with the original plan outlined in 1 Cor. xvi, according to which he was to come to them via Macedonia? And as regards the plan referred to in 2 Cor. i. 15 ff., is not the whole situation immensely clarified if we believe that this was an earlier plan, which that of 1 Cor. xvi. was meant to supersede? Both passages, studied carefully, will be seen to favour this interpretation.

(1) As regards 1 Cor. xvi. 5 ff. Here we shall look first (*a*) at the general situation, and then (*b*) at the way in which the announcement is made.

(*a*) On leaving Ephesus the apostle is to travel via Macedonia. He has only too good reason to know that this announcement will not be pleasing to the jealous and suspicious elements in the Corinthian church[1]; so he sets himself in advance to disarm possible criticism by telling frankly some of the considerations that have weighed with him in adopting the present course. Not,

[1] It has often been assumed (largely on the basis of 2 Cor. i. 15 ff.) that Paul had himself announced his intention of visiting Corinth before going on to Macedonia. If he had, this would of course increase the Corinthian resentment at the change of plan. See p. 174.

we may add, that he necessarily tells them everything ; it is possible that he may have some additional reason for not visiting Corinth at the present juncture. But after all the reason which he gives is probably the decisive one. Between the Pentecost at which he leaves Ephesus and the time when he (or the delegates) arrive at Jerusalem with the collection,[1] he knows that he must visit both Macedonia and Corinth. A winter is to intervene during which extensive travelling is impossible, and he must therefore consider where he is to spend it, and possibly Paul has already determined that the voyage to Palestine had better be begun not from Macedonia but from Corinth.[2] Paul has therefore to think out his itinerary carefully. He is more eager than at this time he cares to tell the Corinthians about making a success of this collection-scheme and securing the dispatch of the gift to Jerusalem ; but in the meantime there is much work to be done both in Macedonia and in Corinth, all the more as this may be the last opportunity he will have of visiting those parts before going on to Rome. Thus now, as always, it is the work of the gospel and nothing else that determines Paul's movements and activity ; and even if there is petty jealousy in Corinth, he cannot allow that to dictate for him his plan of action.

(*b*) Accordingly, when we turn to the language in which Paul announces his itinerary, we see how simply but unmistakably he makes it clear to his readers (note the twice-repeated phrase in ver. 5, ' make a tour of Macedonia ') that there is work to be done which must take

[1] Probably even at this date Paul hoped to arrive at Jerusalem in time for Pentecost (cf. Acts xx. 16) of the following year. Pentecost was the feast at which the first fruits were offered, and would therefore be an appropriate time for presenting the freewill offering of his Gentile churches.

[2] So both here and in the alternative scheme of 2 Cor. i. 15 f.

him first to Macedonia. We may note in passing that we can well understand the apostle's eagerness to do further mission-work in that area. While he had been privileged in both Corinth and Ephesus to make a prolonged stay, and to evangelise in each case the whole province, in Macedonia his work had in city after city been cut short by violent if unenlightened opposition. He knows of course that this decision to spend time in Macedonia will be criticised at Corinth, hence the language in which he announces it is carefully chosen in every phrase.

(i) In going first to Macedonia (of which Corinth would seem to have been jealous) he is guided not merely by some personal predilection; he has, he explains, evangelistic work to do on the way.

(ii) His visit to Corinth will perhaps be one of some duration (ver. 6). He apparently realises that circumstances may militate against this (is he thinking of the possibility of unpleasantness in Corinth?); hence the 'perhaps' (ver. 6) and the phrase in ver. 7: 'if the Lord allow.' Still, such is his intention, and he evidently implies that the length of his stay may be some compensation to the Corinthians for any disappointment they may suffer from his not coming to them direct. When he adds: "I do not want to see you *now* (ἄρτι) *in passing* (ἐν παρόδῳ)" he clearly (on the most natural interpretation of ἄρτι) has in mind an *earlier* scheme, such as that outlined in 2 Cor. i. 16, according to which his stay in Corinth would have been limited by the necessity of passing on to Macedonia, and he indicates the obvious advantage of a scheme which will enable him to settle down among them for a prolonged period, possibly even to pass the winter among them.

(iii) Further, he reminds them that Timothy may

arrive soon, and in pleading that he will be favourably received Paul adds significantly: "he carries on the Lord's work, just as I do" (ver. 10). In other words, Paul tacitly apologises for his own absence by requesting that Timothy will be welcomed as his deputy. Paul is careful, too, to add that he has brought pressure to bear (πολλὰ παρεκάλεσα) on Apollos to visit Corinth. Clearly he is anxious that the Corinthians should not interpret his delay in coming to them as implying any lack of interest.

Throughout all this passage there sounds an apologetic undernote. It is the language of a man who is announcing a decision that he knows will not be popular, who realises that his action will be critically scrutinised and probably misjudged, and who further has only too great cause to fear that things may yet turn out in a way very different from what he ventures to express here as his hope.

(2) We turn to 2 Cor. i. 15 ff. Our proposed reconstruction, viz. that the plan of 1 Cor. xvi. 5 was a later modification of that referred to in 2 Cor. i. 15 ff., is likewise borne out by the terms and the general tone of the second of these passages. To start with, the phrase ἐβουλόμην πρότερον acquires added significance if, instead of referring vaguely to a time before Paul entered on the present journey through Macedonia (*i.e.* when 2 Corinthians was written), it indicates that before formulating (as in 1 Cor. xvi.) the plan which he had ultimately adopted (*i.e.* on the occasion of the 'sorrowful visit') the apostle *had intended* to pay them the double compliment, and give himself the double joy of visiting the Corinthians on his way both to and from Macedonia. In what follows Paul tacitly admits—he cannot indeed do otherwise—that that intention had not been carried out;

but the very fact that he had in all sincerity entertained it ought, he implies, to acquit him of the charge of ἐλαφρία.[1] It is important to note that the true implication of ἐλαφρία is not, as has been too generally assumed, 'fickleness' manifested in a change of purpose, but 'light-heartedness,' 'lack of interest,' manifested in his neglect of Corinth (in favour of Macedonia).

Nor is this reconstruction countered by what follows in vers. 17 ff. In these verses the careful balancing of 'Yea' and 'Nay' does indeed reveal Paul on his defence against the reproach of changeableness,[2] and the proper inference might therefore seem to be that the plan which is now under discussion in vers. 15 f. is a departure from a previous plan, and that Paul is justifying himself for making the change. Such an inference is, however, unsound. There has indeed been a change of plan, but the change was made when the earlier plan (ver. 15) of proceeding direct to Corinth was abandoned. When therefore Paul appeals in ver. 15 to that earlier intention he does so firstly to claim acquittal from the charge of ἐλαφρία, indifference; for, as he shows, his hope had then been to pay them a double visit. He has, however, to admit that that intention was afterwards abandoned, viz. when he wrote 1 Cor. xvi., and therefore he proceeds to declare in the most emphatic way that that change was dictated by the highest religious motives, and that self-interest had no place in it.

A further question of interest arises here. It follows

[1] The use of the definite article τῇ ἐλαφρίᾳ (ver. 17) shows that we have here a specific charge which the apostle knows has been urged against him.

[2] This seems to be by far the most natural interpretation, though a not impossible alternative would be to read the words as implying, not unreliability, but a desire to please, a readiness, *i.e.*, to give any answer that would win acceptance.

from the above that the earlier intention of going first to Corinth had not merely been cherished by the apostle, but had become known to the Corinthians. There is nothing at all unlikely in this. It is true that the phrase ἐβουλόμην πρότερον, taken by itself, implies nothing more than a wish that Paul himself had once entertained, and it may therefore be that he is revealing that fact now to the Corinthians for the first time. But it would be quite unjustifiable to argue from the phrase that the plan had remained shut up in the mind of the apostle, and had never (whether by direct communication or otherwise) become known to the Corinthians until now. We have already seen that the apologetic language of 1 Cor. xvi. implies that the plan which is there announced (of proceeding first to Macedonia) is likely to disappoint the Corinthians, and that disappointment would be all the more intelligible if they had been previously led to expect that the apostle was to come to them direct.

A sympathetic reading therefore of the passage 2 Cor. i. 15 ff. shows that the apostle is not there defending himself *in advance* from the possible criticism that he is coming to them *now* via Macedonia ; rather he is replying to certain reproaches which have previously been made against him, and made (we may believe) on the occasion of the sorrowful visit, or subsequently to it. One complaint was that he allowed other interests to make him indifferent to the welfare of his Corinthian church ; another, which served to show his lack of concern, was that, having promised to come to them direct, he later wrote (1 Cor. xvi.) that he would only come to them after a prolonged tour through Macedonia.

It is no serious objection to dating the plan of 2 Cor. i. before that of 1 Cor. xvi. that in the former Paul refers definitely to going on from Corinth to Judæa, whereas in

the latter he is not quite sure whether he will go himself or merely send deputies. It may well have been that subsequent experience of the difficulties likely to attend the carrying out of the collection-scheme made him less certain that the amount collected would make it worth his while to go in person ; or else in writing 2 Cor. i. he has invested his earlier intention with a definiteness which did not always belong to it. I think it is probable that Paul all along purposed and hoped to go in person if it were at all possible. We can infer this from the deep significance which he attaches to the scheme, and with this agrees the strong language of Acts xix. 21, where we are told that Paul 'resolved in the spirit' to go through Macedonia and Achaia on his way to Jerusalem, adding that he must afterwards visit Rome. Naturally the intention was subject to review from time to time, as that pathetic ἐὰν ἄξιον ᾖ shows (1 Cor. xvi. 4 ; cf. ἐὰν ὁ κύριος ἐπιτρέψῃ in 1 Cor. xvi. 7). But it would have been pedantic for Paul in 2 Cor. i. 16 to cumber further an already cumbersome sentence by ending : " be sped by you on my way to Judæa, that is, if in the end I decided to go in person." After all, Paul's point was that the departure for Jerusalem was to be made from Corinth ; and it did not affect this part of the plan whether in the end he accompanied the delegates or not.

ii. *The 'Sorrowful Visit'*

From the foregoing argument we may therefore regard it as established that Paul's plans for visiting Corinth are to be arranged as follows :

(i) His first intention was to go from Ephesus to Corinth, then to Macedonia, then back to Corinth, and from there go on to Judæa. 2 Cor. i. 15 ff. Plan Y.

(ii) He later announced (1 Cor. xvi. 5) that he would

proceed to Corinth via Macedonia, and he hoped then to make a long stay. Plan X.

And we have no reason to doubt that when he actually did leave Ephesus he followed the route announced in the second plan.

Here there opens out before us a possible reconstruction which deserves consideration. May not the journey begun in accordance with this second plan (1 Cor. xvi.) have been the journey which culminated in the sorrowful visit to Corinth? Instead of assuming that the sorrowful visit was entirely an incidental visit, undertaken by the apostle with the definite intention of returning as soon as possible to his base at Ephesus, why should we not believe that it falls into the setting of the plan of 1 Cor. xvi., and that, when Paul set out on the journey in the course of which he had the sorrowful experience at Corinth, it was with the thought that for the time being at least his work at Ephesus was at an end? A very good case can be made out for this reconstruction, and in the pages that follow an attempt will be made to work it out in some detail; but in at least one important respect it would seem to call for modification. It may or may not have been the case—for the present we shall leave it an open question—that when Paul left Ephesus (before the sorrowful visit to Corinth) he did so in fulfilment of the design of 1 Cor. xvi. and with no thought of a speedy return to the Asian capital; but various considerations point to the termination that the visit to Corinth did not come normally at the termination of the proposed missionary tour through Macedonia, but was indeed an incidental and unpremeditated visit after an interruption of another plan which the apostle had undertaken, and that after it Paul returned to Asia, and resumed the journey that had been interrupted.

Among the reasons which seem to favour this interpretation of the sorrowful visit as being in some way an interruption of a larger plan, two may here be mentioned :

(1) In the first place there is the fact that after the sorrowful visit Paul returned to Asia (he speaks of coming to Troas, 2 Cor. ii. 12), an action which is difficult to explain except on the assumption that the visit had interrupted his plans for work there.

(2) A second reason emerges from a sympathetic study of Paul's language in 2 Cor. i. 15—ii. 1. In these verses the apostle seeks to meet a charge of ἐλαφρία, *i.e.* lack of concern on his part for his Corinthian Church ; and we have seen that the basis of this charge lay in the fact that, instead of proceeding direct to Corinth, Paul's plan (as announced to the Corinthians) was to postpone his visit until after an extensive missionary tour in Macedonia. Now it is natural to believe that Paul has still this charge in mind when in ver. 23 he goes on to give his reasons for not returning to Corinth. " I call God to witness that it was to spare you that I refrained from coming to Corinth."

Here a question of great interest and importance emerges : What is the occasion to which Paul refers (i. 23), when apparently he might have come to Corinth but preferred to stay away ? The language of ii. 1 shows clearly that the occasion is subsequent to the sorrowful visit. This is important. It means that the charge of ἐλαφρία was occasioned not merely by the original *announcement* (1 Cor. xvi.) of the plan which gave Macedonia precedence over Corinth, but by Paul's policy in

1 ἔκρινα δέ (which we may note is a better-attested reading than ἔκρινα γάρ) follows up οὐκέτι ἦλθον in i. 23 (ver. 24 is parenthetical and the time referred to in the two verses is approximately the same.

adhering to that plan after the occasion of the sorrowful visit. From this point of view the sorrowful visit did indeed partake of the character of an incidental visit: at the conclusion of it the apostle returned to Asia and proceeded to carry out the plan which, ever since its announcement, had continued to be viewed with so much disfavour at Corinth, of directing his attention meanwhile to Macedonia.

This view of the incidental character of the visit to Corinth is of course not altogether free from difficulty. So far as the apostle is concerned he may indeed, despite the length of the journey and the possibility that unforeseen developments might necessitate a protracted stay, have set out with no other intention than that of fitting in an emergency call; but as for the Corinthians, who had been expecting a visit from him, why, it may be asked, should they take it for granted, once he does appear (no matter by what route), that this visit does not 'count,' and why at a later date should he adopt an apologetic attitude for not coming to them straight instead of going on first to Macedonia?[1] Surely the outstanding fact regarding this visit was that he had promised to come—and now he had arrived. As to the

[1] This argument tells with especial force against that other form under which the incidental character of the sorrowful visit is generally maintained, and which we believe must be abandoned: see p. 168 (*c*). For, on that reconstruction, if the sorrowful visit was paid *before* plan Y was formed, the visit would have showed that Paul had abandoned his previous plan X of first visiting Macedonia and had now clearly given the preference to Corinth. If, on the other hand, it came *after* the formulation of plan Y, the facts of the case were that, by abandoning his earlier plan X in favour of plan Y, Paul had decided (and perhaps also announced) that after all he was to come to Corinth direct, and that intention he had now carried out. In either case the Corinthians must have viewed the result with satisfaction, and there was no obvious need for an apology.

route, the fact that he had come (as we must assume him to have done) by sea, setting aside his plan of going immediately to Macedonia and doing Corinth the honour of coming there first, must surely have been interpreted by the Corinthians in no other way than as a sign of his regard for them ; why, then, this continued talk after he had gone of ἐλαφρία ?

The above objection may well seem serious, and the only answer that can be given to it—and to my mind it is a sufficient answer—is that the visit did not satisfy the Corinthians just because it was obviously a flying visit. They saw clearly that Paul had no thought then of devoting his time and attention to Corinth : his idea was to return as soon as possible to Asia, and from there to advance on Macedonia. Part of the unhappiness of the visit is occasioned by the fact that its incidental character added fuel to the fire of already existing disaffection.

Our conclusion, therefore, is that the sorrowful visit to Corinth was essentially an interpolation, at the conclusion of which the apostle departed to resume the work that had thereby been interrupted. But I do not believe that it was from Ephesus as a base that the incidental visit was made, or that it was necessarily followed by a return to Ephesus. Here we now revert to the hypothesis suggested on p. 176, according to which the sorrowful visit belongs to the time of the missionary tour which the apostle outlined in 1 Cor. xvi., and on which he entered after his stay at Ephesus was ended.

iii. *From Corinth to Troas*

According, then, to our reconstruction we picture the apostle leaving Ephesus about Pentecost. He sets out to go through Macedonia. All the time he is anxious

about Corinth, where the air at this time is full of suspicion and disaffection, and at one stage of his journey news arrives which determines him to take immediate action. He will go direct to Corinth. He goes, no doubt, as he had once seen might be necessary, 'with a rod' (1 Cor. iv. 21). How long he stayed we cannot tell.[1] What we do know is that the visit was marked by great unpleasantness, and that the apostle found it expedient to leave. Some time after leaving he wrote the so-called sorrowful letter, designed to prepare the way for a re-establishment of peace and good-will. When next we hear of Paul, he has arrived at Troas, meaning evidently to carry on a mission there (2 Cor. ii. 12), but he is unable to rest, so eager is he to meet Titus and to learn the latest news regarding the tragic situation in Corinth. Titus and he finally meet in Macedonia.

It has generally been assumed that, on his sorrowful departure from Corinth, Paul returned to Ephesus, that it was from there that in all probability he sent the sorrowful letter, and from there that, after an interval, he set out on the journey to Troas and Macedonia, all eager to meet Titus. Such may indeed have been the case; for those who assume that an Ephesian imprisonment falls into this period, a return to Ephesus is a necessary postulate. But that he did so return to Ephesus there is no clear evidence. All that we have to guide us is (*a*) the reference in 2 Cor. i. 8 to a terrible experience which befell the apostle in Asia—which possibly indicates a quite recent experience, subsequent to the 'sorrowful visit,' though we need not infer that it naturally took place in Ephesus; and (*b*) the fact that Paul came from some

[1] Unless by any chance Acts xx. 3, with its account of a three months' stay, refers really to this visit and not, as the verses that follow would imply, to another visit made soon afterwards.

place unspecified to Troas (2 Cor. ii. 12) 'for the sake of the gospel of Christ,' and so passed on to Macedonia; from which, however, we can gather nothing of his movements immediately before coming to Troas. Further, one can see no good reason why the apostle should at this stage have resumed work in Ephesus. He had already laboured for three years there, lengthening his stay somewhat because of the opportunities of the situation (1 Cor. xvi. 8); and when at last he did leave for Macedonia and Corinth—doing so, as we have seen, as part of an advance movement, and not merely so as to fit in a visit to Corinth and then return to Ephesus—we must presume that it was because his work there was completed.

The suggestion therefore presents itself: may it not have been that, forced to leave Corinth, the apostle went direct to Troas? At first sight there seems much to be said for this hypothesis. From Corinth to Troas was a recognised sea-crossing, and a few months later Paul's companions took this route when he himself went by Macedonia (Acts xx. 5). It may be objected that by so doing he was doubling on his course in the same way as if he had returned to Ephesus. This is scarcely true. Ephesus had had the benefit of his presence for three years, whereas Troas, so far as we know, had not received the attention which its importance justified.[1] But the objection is immediately robbed of its force when we recall that the visit to Corinth is an interruption of the apostle's general plan of tour. What if that interruption had come to him when, after leaving Ephesus, he had arrived at Troas? If it was at Troas that he had

1 Troas had been passed by unevangelised when, some years before, the call had first come to Paul to come over to Macedonia (Acts xvi. 8 ff.).

news about Corinth which had made it imperative for him to fit in a visit to that city with as little delay as possible, it would be supremely natural for him—he may even have given a promise to that effect—to return to Troas as soon as the Corinthian situation would allow him to do so. And (though we do not wish to anticipate a subsequent argument) was it on this occasion that Paul left behind the cloak and parchments which later he wished Timothy to bring to him (2 Tim. iv. 13)?

The hypothesis that Paul crossed direct from Corinth to Troas is not without attractiveness; but a reason for doubting it emerges from a consideration of the circumstances under which the sorrowful letter was written. Had Paul by any chance an opportunity of sending it before he left Greece? May it have been meditated on the voyage and dispatched very soon after the landing in Asia? Or must we allow for an interval of some duration during which the apostle was otherwise engaged in Asia? On the whole it would appear that some time—not necessarily much, for a letter might reach Corinth in a week by sea—must have elapsed between the apostle's arrival in Asia and his coming to Troas, seeing that, according to 2 Cor. ii. 12 f., he expected at Troas to find Titus with news of the letter's reception.[1] Time too must be found for the terrible experience in Asia referred to in 2 Cor. i. 8 ff. In our next chapter, dealing with certain personal references in the Epistles to Timothy,

[1] It may be objected that on this argument we are reading too much into Paul's word εὑρεῖν and into the use of the participle ἐλθών: the Greek does not necessarily imply that *when he arrived* he expected to find Titus awaiting him, and the meaning may rather be that the apostle came to Troas intending there to wait for Titus, and was disappointed when, as time went on, Titus failed to appear. But it can scarcely be claimed that this is the natural interpretation of the passage.

further evidence will be forthcoming from which we are inclined to infer that Paul returned from Corinth to Miletus (2 Tim. iv. 20). But it probably remains true that, just as it was at Troas that Paul decided to pay an immediate visit to Corinth, so too his intention, which subsequent events induced him to modify, was to return direct to Troas to carry on evangelistic work there before crossing over to Macedonia.

CHAPTER XIV

THE PERSONAL REFERENCES IN THE EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY

In a study of Paul's Ephesian ministry it may seem strange to appeal to the Pastoral Epistles, but evidence lies buried there which, if only we can sift it aright, may well turn out to be invaluable. Into the maze of problems raised by these epistles it is not necessary for us here to enter. If they are genuine, they are generally felt to demand for their setting a period of Pauline activity later than the Roman imprisonment described in Acts, though in their present form it is extremely doubtful if they can be admitted as coming from the hand of the apostle at all. There are certain fragments of them, however, consisting mainly of personal references, which no unbiased reader can fail to recognise as authentic fragments of Pauline correspondence. Some of these fragments we now proceed to examine. In the present chapter we shall confine ourselves to the First and Second Epistles to Timothy, with special reference to the important passage 2 Tim. iv. 6–22.

i. *Is 2 Timothy written from Rome or from Ephesus?*

The Second Epistle to Timothy has often been regarded as written from Rome; cf. the reference to Rome in 2 Tim. i. 17, a passage which, if genuine, rules out all possibility of a date anterior to Paul's arrival in the Imperial capital. In iv. 6–22, however, we have

passage, undoubtedly genuine, which presents insuperable difficulties to any attempt to connect it with the Roman imprisonment recorded at the end of Acts. To recall two of the most familiar of these difficulties, some five or six years have elapsed since Paul, if he was now under the shadow of his trial after a two years' residence in Rome, was last at Troas and Miletus (Acts xx. 6, 15): is it only now that he feels the need of his warm cloak[1] (ver. 13), or thinks it worth while to inform Timothy (who presumably is in or near Ephesus, within visiting distance of the unfortunate invalid) that, all these years before, Trophimus had been left sick at Miletus (ver. 20)?

Resort has accordingly been made to the hypothesis that 2 Timothy was written during a second Roman imprisonment, and that many of the personal references in the letter touch a period of missionary activity between the two imprisonments. Support is indeed not lacking for the view that Paul may have been released after his two years' residence in Rome described in Acts: a plausible conjecture is that his accusers did not appear to prosecute their case, and that judgment went against them by default. But, apart from the fact that, if Paul was granted this further period of activity, he was more likely to devote it to the West than to the East (cf. the reference to Spain in Rom. xv. 28), we can scarcely rest satisfied with a solution of our problem which explains every difficulty by referring it to a period about which we happen to know nothing; and the

[1] The *Peshitto* seems to interpret φελόνη as a bag or box for holding manuscripts. But Greek usage, as we see even in the papyri, is overwhelmingly in favour of the meaning 'cloak.' Moreover, the grouping of phrases in the sentence indicates that there is no intimate connection between the φελόνη and the βιβλία and μεμβράναι.

hypothesis comes further under grave suspicion when we see that, with regard to the general situation of the apostle, the places which he visits, the companions with whom he is associated, it involves a set of circumstances which are more or less a repetition of those with which we are familiar in an earlier period of his missionary career.

Not merely, however, do the various references point us away from Rome; they point us definitely to Asia. Paul has recently been at Troas and Miletus (iv. 13, 20); the companions of whom he writes (iv. 9 ff.), viz. Demas, Titus, Luke, Mark, Tychicus, Aquila and Priscilla, Erastus, Trophimus, were all with him during the Ephesian ministry. Apparently he has been, and perhaps is now, a prisoner (iv. 16); and he has suffered much from the evil influence of Alexander (iv. 14)—can this be the same as the Alexander who intervened in the Demetrius riot at Ephesus (Acts xix. 33)?

Dismissing, therefore, from our minds any hampering idea that the letter is necessarily written from Rome, we approach the personal references to see whether we can fit their various details into any period of the Ephesian ministry. It is just possible that they do not all belong to the same period. If we operate with the hypothesis that the letter as a whole is a later production than the sections which contain the personal references, it may well be that the personal references belong not to one fragment merely, but to several. Thus Harrison, in his book, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (pp. 118 ff.), regards 2 Tim. iv. 13–15, 20, 21*a*, as written from Macedonia, after the visit to Troas mentioned in 2 Cor. ii. 12 f.; iv. 16–18*a* (18*b*?), as written from Cæsarea, soon after the apostle's arrival under escort from Jerusalem; iv. 9–12, 22*b* is written from Rome,

summoning Timothy to join him; and, as this last message reached Timothy too late, there follows at a slightly later date Paul's farewell message from Rome, part of which (to say nothing of other possible fragments) we have in i. 16–18 and iv. 6–8. Any such attempt at analysis and reconstruction is, however, so involved and so subjective that it can hardly expect to command general acceptance; and in the pages which follow we shall endeavour to show that the whole section iv. 9–22, together very probably with the preceding verses, iv. 6–8, form a unity dating from the time of Paul's return to Asia after the sorrowful visit to Corinth, and that i. 15–18 probably belongs to the same critical period.

ii. 2 *Timothy i.* 15–18

We take up first the passage in 2 Tim. i. 15–18. Paul begins by recalling something which Timothy knows, viz. that all the Asiatics (*πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ*) deserted him. We need not treat Paul's language here with unimaginative literalness. While the Asiatics are clearly Christians, Paul does not necessarily imply that there has been a general apostasy throughout the churches of Asia. What he has in mind (as is borne out by the use of the aorist tense *ἀπεστράφησαν*) is a definite crisis in his own career, when the Asiatic Christians who were near him at the time all failed to support him and probably also disowned him. It was a definite rejection, not necessarily of Christianity, but rather of Paul. The episode recalls what he says of his isolation at the time of his defence (2 Tim. iv. 16): "I had no one to support me; they all deserted me." Further, the phrase 'thou knowest' (ver. 15) need not indicate that Timothy was present at the time:

the occurrence was one of which all Paul's associates would have heard with sorrow, and the reason why Paul, who has just been encouraging Timothy to be faithful to his trust, mentions it here is partly at least because he wished to tell how one disciple, Onesiphorus (almost certainly an Asiatic) had shown a loyalty which stood out in marked contrast to the defection of the others.

We have said that the desertion of the Asiatics referred to a definite episode when probably the apostle was present, and not merely to a general tendency. When and where did this episode take place? Owing to the reference to Rome in ver. 17 the passage is generally regarded as having been written during the Roman imprisonment or later; and as the desertion must surely have occurred in Asia itself the occasion of that episode must have been either the apostle's residence during the 'third' missionary journey or a later visit after a release from Rome. Of these alternatives the second is not attractive, and if we are drawn rather to accept the first we are led on to suspect the truth of our premise that the date of writing is as late as the Roman imprisonment. In brief, are the words γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ genuine? To view the matter from another angle, there is obviously a close connection in thought between the loyalty of Onesiphorus and the disloyalty of the general body, and is not part at least of the connection that both episodes belong generally to the same period and the same locality?—which means, on the interpretation which we favour, that they both took place in Asia during the three years' Ephesian ministry. There is also, we may recall in passing, reason to doubt whether so many of Paul's eastern companions visited the apostle in Rome as has generally been supposed (cf. p. 89).

If we suspect the words *γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ*, how are we to explain them? We can hardly take seriously the view sometimes expressed that *ῥώμη* is here not the Imperial capital, but the word meaning 'strength.' In some way or other the phrase may have arisen as a gloss, based on the late tradition of a Roman origin of the letter. At one time I was inclined to think that it might possibly be a corruption of an original reading *ἐν Πριήνῃ*. Onesiphorus's signal loyalty, as we have said, was probably manifested in Asia (where the others so sadly failed); but, as ver. 18 clearly implies, the locality in the case of ver. 17 was somewhere other than Ephesus. Priene was an ancient city on the promontory Mycale, half-way between Ephesus and Miletus. It was the scene each year of the great Panionian festival in honour of Poseidon Heliconius, and we can imagine that on such an occasion Paul would be present to seek an audience for the Christian message. If so, it would seem that there again he was attacked and arrested. But a preferable explanation, to which we shall revert later (pp. 195, 198), is that (as is indicated in the note appended to the epistle in Codex A and in the Coptic versions) the ascription of the letter to Rome displaced another tradition according to which it was associated with Laodicea; so that perhaps in our present passage the original reading may have been *ἐν Λαοδικίᾳ*.

iii. 2 *Timothy* iv. 6–8

In 2 Tim. iv. 6–8 we have a passage which has sometimes been called Paul's swan-song, and assigned to the closing days of his Roman imprisonment. He has just been urging Timothy to play his part with sobriety, courage, and faithfulness, and he goes on in these verses

to enforce his appeal by a reminder that his own career is now nearing an end. "So far as I am concerned, my life's blood is now being poured forth as a libation; the time has come for me to depart." Here surely we have an authentic echo of the voice that sounds in Philippians (i. 23, ii. 17); and the interval which separates sound and echo cannot be great. If we cared, of course, we might say that in each case Paul is writing from his (first) Roman imprisonment. But we have already seen good reason to believe that Philippians was written during an imprisonment in Ephesus, and may not the verses in 2 Timothy carry us back to some part of that same critical period? Let us try to reconstruct the situation on that hypothesis.

We have seen how Philippians was dispatched while Timothy was still with the apostle; his name had indeed been attached to the superscription; and with the tone and tenor of the epistle he would be quite familiar. Since that time, however, and it may be after a period during which several attacks were made on the life and liberty of the apostle, the clouds that were then seen hovering on the horizon have gathered dark and lowering overhead; and writing now to his faithful lieutenant to tell him how in the interval the situation has grown critical in the extreme, he catches up the figurative expressions of the earlier letter, and by a series of perfect tenses emphasises that what were then seen as possibilities have now become dire actualities. "If my life-blood should be poured out" (*εἰ σπένδομαι*), he had written hypothetically in Phil. ii. 17; now he tells Timothy, "that offering of my blood is at last being made" (*ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι*). "I have a strong desire," he had said then, "to take my departure (*ἀναλῦσαι*), and be with Christ"; and now he writes,

" the time of my departure (*ὁ καιρὸς τῆς ἀναλύσεώς μου*) has arrived." Then he had told how, like a runner still engaged in life's long and arduous race, he was ever pressing on towards the goal for the prize of God's high calling in Christ Jesus (Phil. iii. 12 ff.); now he acknowledges that the race is ended and he is ready to receive the prize. The *ἤδη* of 2 Tim. iv. 6 replaces the *οὐκ ἤδη* of Phil. iii. 12. Now he can say *τετέλεκα*, where formerly he had said *οὐ τετελείωμαι*. Soon now he will be privileged to attain to the resurrection of the dead (Phil. iii. 10), and, conscious that he will do so, not having his own righteousness, but the righteousness which is by faith in Christ Jesus, he looks forward to receive from the righteous Judge (cf. *τὸ βραβεῖον* in Phil. iii. 14) the crown of righteousness, a heavenly crown of which his converts on earth have been to him an earthly anticipation (Phil. iv. 1).

In view of those parallels we should have no hesitation in linking up 2 Tim. iv. 6–8 with the Epistle to the Philippians, though what is the precise form of the link we have yet to determine. The answer to that question is of secondary importance for our inquiry at this point, and we postpone the treatment of it to an additional note (p. 212).

iv. 2 *Timothy iv.* 9–20

(a) Written from Asia after Paul's return from Corinth

In this section, again, there is much which at first sight might seem to take us back to a critical period in the Ephesian ministry. With regard to Demas, who had been with Paul at Ephesus during one imprisonment (Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24), we can picture him deserting during the imprisonment period (he himself need

never have been under arrest), and the apostle, whose supreme interest was always in his churches, may even at this critical hour have sent off Crescens and Titus just as shortly before he had dispatched Timothy and Erastus. The references to the trial, too, would come, in the main, appropriately from one who was now languishing in prison, sustaining his soul with the confident belief that, whatever happened to his body, the Lord had reserved for his spirit an eternal deliverance; and he takes occasion to point out to Timothy the danger which, when he comes, he too must guard against.

On one matter, however, we may clear our minds at the outset. 2 Tim. iv. 9 ff. cannot date from the first Ephesian imprisonment, during which Philippians was written. For—

(1) The apostle is here writing to Timothy, asking him to come and join him. But Timothy, as we see from Philippians, was with the apostle during the first imprisonment, and in view of the statement in Phil. ii. 23 that he hopes to send Timothy to Macedonia once he sees how things are to go with himself, it is unlikely that Timothy was dispatched until the crisis was definitely over.

(2) Even if Timothy had been sent off, the information now given to him about Trophimus (iv. 20) would be belated in view of the fact that he had been with the apostle during the earlier part of the imprisonment.

(3) The references to Troas and Miletus (iv. 13, 20) would require us to assume a journey, of which we have no knowledge, made shortly before the imprisonment began.

(4) The statement that Erastus is remaining at Corinth shows that we are now at a later period than the writing of Philippians; for there is every reason to think that

Timothy and Erastus left Ephesus for the West, if not together, at least at about the same time, but Timothy's departure is still something that is looked forward to when Philippians is written.

(5) Demas was faithful to the apostle during the imprisonment when Colossians and Philemon were written; but this, as we have sought to prove, was the second imprisonment. The reference to Demas has indeed a very important bearing on our reconstruction; for if the 2 Timothy fragment is written from an Asian prison, the occasion must be subsequent to the writing of Colossians and Philemon.

But we may now go on a stage further and question whether iv. 9 ff. can be written from Ephesus at all. In ver. 19 we have salutations sent to Prisca and Aquila and to the house of Onesiphorus,[1] all of whom we may well believe were in Ephesus, and who cannot at least have been with Timothy in Macedonia. Similarly the language of ver. 12, "Tychicus I have sent (am sending?) to Ephesus," is at least strange if Paul, even though shut up in prison, is himself in that city.

Driven therefore to see that the passage cannot belong to a first Ephesian imprisonment, and probably does not belong to Ephesus at all, we are led to conjecture that the occasion of writing may be a later Asian crisis, the scene of which lay some distance away from Ephesus; and in this connection we recall that in the opening verses of 2 Corinthians, where the apostle informs his readers of a terrible experience from which he has recently been delivered, all he says with regard to the scene of the episode is that it was 'in Asia'—he does not specify that it was in

[1] For Onesiphorus at Ephesus cf. 2 Tim. i. 16–18; and see p. 188.

Ephesus, and it may, therefore, have been in some other part of the province.

(b) A third Asian imprisonment in Laodicea?

From the above certain important results follow.

(1) If the crisis in 2 Tim. iv. 16 is to be identified with that of 2 Cor. i. 8 f., then the undefined θλίψις in the latter passage was indeed associated with imprisonment, and we may note how closely akin the two passages are in the way they express both the gravity of the danger and the wonder of the deliverance; cf. too the confident hope of future deliverance with which both passages conclude.[1]

(2) It may be possible, though we do not propose to stress this, to make use here of the conjecture tentatively put forward on p. 189, viz. that in 2 Tim. i. 18 there was originally a reference to an imprisonment at Priene. Might it be that, on returning from Corinth, Paul crossed to Miletus, and advancing inland was arrested

[1] Though the resemblance between the two passages is interesting, we cannot safely build on it as evidence that the two descriptions belong to the same period of writing or relate to the same event. The passage in 2 Timothy has even closer affinities with Philippians, which on our view is the product of an earlier imprisonment: *e.g.* ὁ δὲ Κύριός μοι παρέστη (ver. 17), cf. (Phil. iv. 5) ὁ Κύριος ἐγγύς, which occurs in a passage enforcing the value of Christian assurance, and where the emphasis is on the Lord's nearness to His people rather than on His apocalyptic coming (cf. *Maranatha* in 1 Cor. xvi. 22); ἐνεδυνάμωσέν με, ἵνα . . . πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (ver. 17), cf. (Phil. iv. 13) πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με. But though no argument pointing to a precise date can be deduced from these resemblances, it is something that on our reconstruction the three epistles in which they occur all belong to the same *general* period of stress and strain at Ephesus. An alternative method of dealing with them would be to refer the 2 Timothy passage to a fabricator who knew how to use Pauline phrases. But unless necessity compels us we prefer to adopt a less violent explanation.

at Priene? More probably, however, the tone of the letter, and especially the eager request of ver. 21 that Timothy should do his best to come before winter, suggests that a greater distance than that between Priene and Ephesus now separates Timothy from his master. We shall consider later (p. 198) whether the place may not have been Laodicea.

(3) But the most significant result by far is that we must now reckon with the possibility of there having been *three* imprisonments in Asia—one during which Philippians was written, a second (following the riot), when Colossians and Philemon were written, and now a third (elsewhere than in Ephesus) after Paul's return from Corinth. Those who have never imagined that Paul's Ephesian ministry was disturbed even once by arrest may be disposed to cavil when we go on to postulate not merely a second but even a third imprisonment. But apart from all that we have learned about the violence of the opposition to the apostle at this period, we have only to recall his own proud boast in 2 Cor. xi. 23 f. of the number of imprisonments he had endured for the gospel's sake, and the sorrowful reference in his address to the Ephesian elders regarding the trials he had suffered in Asia as a result of Jewish plots (Acts xx. 19).

The question, however, may be raised whether all these imprisonments are necessarily to be distinguished from one another. We have already shown (p. 192) that the conditions behind the 2 Timothy passage are certainly different from those of the first Ephesian imprisonment; but with regard to the second and third imprisonments, while we have tended in our earlier chapters to assign Colossians and Philemon to an imprisonment following the riot and anterior to the visit to Corinth, may it not rather be the case that both in Colossians (and

Philemon) and in 2 Tim. iv. we are dealing with an imprisonment which falls into the period of Paul's renewed activity in Asia after the 'sorrowful visit'?

The hypothesis is worth considering; but it breaks down on examination.

(1) Aristarchus[1] was with Paul during the crisis of the riot (Acts xix. 29) and at the time of writing Colossians and Philemon; but he is not mentioned in the 2 Timothy passage, either as being with Paul at the time of writing, or (like Demas, Crescens, and Titus) as having recently left. It is therefore more likely that after the riot and the writing of Colossians he had proceeded, in Paul's company at the outset, to his home in Macedonia, and as this would be strictly in accordance with Paul's plan at the time of setting out, Timothy did not require to be informed of it.

(2) Timothy likewise was with Paul at the time when Colossians and Philemon were written, whereas here Paul asks him to come and join him. We cannot argue that the present note is possibly earlier, and that it was in response to the summons sent him here that he was subsequently with the apostle at the time of the writing of Colossians; for references to Demas[2] (who was with

[1] There is no need to dwell on the fact that certain other companions mentioned in Colossians and Philemon are not referred to in 2 Timothy. In the interval many changes would naturally have taken place; *e.g.* Epaphras may be expected to have returned to his post at Colossæ, and anything may have happened to Jesus Justus, whom there is no reason to regard as being, like Aristarchus, a travelling companion of the apostle. Further, we have no right to assume that apart from this note Timothy had no news of the changes which had occurred among Paul's companions in the interval, or that the note would necessarily contain a full *résumé* of all those changes.

[2] Goguel's judgment is surely at fault (*Introduction*, IV, deuxième partie, p. 329) when, noting with Erbes the fact that Demas's name is the only one in the salutations of Colossians which is

his master when Colossians was written, but had left before the time of the 2 Timothy note) make it plain that Colossians is earlier than 2 Tim. iv.

(3) In Colossians Tychicus is being sent to the Lycus valley ; in 2 Timothy he is being sent (from there ?) to Ephesus. This suggests that the situation in 2 Timothy is quite different from, and later than, that in Colossians.

(4) If, following the construction we have adopted regarding Paul's journeys to Corinth, we picture the apostle as paying his ' sorrowful visit ' to that city after he had, as he thought, concluded his ministry in Ephesus, we can scarcely believe that he would have embarked on that journey to the West without taking the opportunity of visiting first the churches in the Lycus valley, as he must have done if Colossians, in which he says he has not yet visited them, is dated from the period of his return to Asia after the ' sorrowful visit.'

On all these accounts, therefore, we conclude that 2 Tim. iv. lends unexpected testimony to a crisis in Asia during which the apostle was met with a renewed outburst of hostility. It was characterised by more than ordinary virulence and success, as we gather from Paul's statements both here and in 2 Tim. i. 18 that his friends all deserted him and he had to face the storm alone ; and with this we may connect the language of deep emotion with which in 2 Cor. i. 8 ff. he tells how he was crushed then beyond his strength and realised that his last hour had come.

Regarding the scene of the crisis we know that, while it was in Asia, it was not in Ephesus (p. 193), and while

mentioned without some accompanying designation, he is willing to see in this an indication that Demas's desertion is now a thing of the past and that Paul shows his indulgence by mentioning him here without reference to his temporary lapse !

suggesting as a possibility that it may have been at Priene we have indicated (p. 195) that more probably a place farther distant from Ephesus ought to be looked for. Now in a manuscript note in Codex A it is affirmed that 2 Timothy was written from Laodicea.[1] Unexpected value sometimes lurks in such a scrap of tradition ; and while the theory of a Roman origin ultimately prevailed, may it not be that, as regards the personal letter embedded in the Epistle, the truth is that it was written from Laodicea ? A journey up-country to Laodicea could be undertaken very easily from Miletus without a visit to Ephesus, and it may well have been the case that, whether or not the apostle had, before his visit to Corinth, carried out the intention he had entertained at that time of visiting the churches in the Lycus valley (Philem. 22), the false teaching current in that neighbourhood had now assumed so serious an aspect that personal intervention seemed necessary to save the situation.

It is no objection to this hypothesis that Timothy is asked, when he comes, to bring the cloak and the parchments which were left at Troas. This need not be taken to mean that Timothy will naturally pass through Troas on his way to join his master ; all that is implied is that he will take steps to secure the articles in question and bring them with him when he comes.

With the general conditions reflected in the fragment we shall deal more particularly in our summing up on pp. 200 ff. Step by step we have been led to the conclusion that in the present letter both Timothy and Paul are in Asia, the former in Ephesus, the latter in a more

[1] In Codex A and in the Coptic Versions both 1 and 2 Timothy are assigned to Laodicea. Doubts may be raised regarding the value of such evidence ; but we quote it merely to corroborate an hypothesis which on other grounds we have seen to be probable.

remote part of the province, perhaps Laodicea; that the defence of which Paul now informs Timothy is a recent occurrence; and that the letter dates from the period of Paul's return to Asia after the sorrowful visit to Corinth.

Paul had left Ephesus about Pentecost, probably rather later. His subsequent journeyings to Troas, Corinth, Miletus, and Laodicea, with all the troubled experiences he encountered on the way, need not have occupied more than a few months, and now, when he writes to Timothy, winter is approaching (2 Tim. iv. 21, cf. ver. 13).

v. *Other Personal References:* 1 *Tim. i.* 3; 1 *Tim. iii.* 14

How, it may be asked, do our conclusions on this 2 Timothy fragment agree with certain other historical references in the First Epistle to Timothy?

(1) 1 Tim. i. 3 shows us Paul setting out for Macedonia, and he asks Timothy to take his place at Ephesus. On the question whether Timothy is here to be regarded as present in Ephesus when the apostle sets out, the evidence, it is true, is not conclusive—*προσμεῖναι*, which would normally mean 'to stay on,' *i.e.* where he was (cf. Acts xviii. 18), might be taken to mean merely 'to wait' (with reference to another's return), and the apostle's request might have been addressed to Timothy in the latter's absence, or at a meeting subsequent to the apostle's departure. But undoubtedly on its simplest interpretation the verse implies that the apostle on beginning his journey leaves Timothy behind him in Ephesus.

It is only natural to see here the same situation as that to which we have so often referred in an earlier part of our enquiry. Paul is setting out for Macedonia; but

the occasion is not that of which he writes in 2 Corinthians, but the earlier journey when he turned aside to visit Corinth. The fact that Macedonia is given as his destination corroborates the view to which on other grounds we have been led, viz. that though the sorrowful visit to Corinth occurred soon after Paul's departure from Asia, his intention at the time of setting out was to proceed direct to Macedonia.

(2) According to 1 Tim. iii. 14 Paul hopes soon to return. This might seem to conflict with the view maintained in this and in previous chapters that Paul on leaving Ephesus regarded his period of active missionary work there as ended. As we have said, however, we are not concerned to rule out a return to Ephesus as impossible if only evidence be forthcoming in support of it; but 1 Tim. iii. 14 need have no bearing on the matter at all. When Paul left Ephesus, he doubtless then hoped (for he did not know what a troublous journey was ahead of him) to be able ere long to pay Ephesus and Timothy a passing call on his way up to Jerusalem.[1] He clearly realised, too, as his language in ver. 15 indicates, that there might be delay before his return. One indication of the disappointment that was to overcome his plans is that, whereas in 1 Timothy he hopes soon to rejoin Timothy, in 2 Tim. iv. he exhorts Timothy to rejoin him.

vi. *General Conditions behind the Personal References in the Epistles to Timothy*

We turn now to review the general conditions reflected in the personal sections of the Epistles to Timothy, with special reference to the fragment 2 Tim. iv. 9 ff., with

[1] It might even be that he contemplated a longer visit on his way from Jerusalem towards Rome; but this is much less probable.

regard to which we assume that it was written from Asia, and possibly from Laodicea, shortly after Paul's return from the sorrowful visit to Corinth.

(1) With regard to the apostle

We begin by noting that according to 2 Tim. iv. 13 he has recently passed through Troas, where he left behind him his cloak and parchments. On this reference to Troas many attempts at reconstruction have been shipwrecked. It has commonly been assumed that the occasion of this visit is either that recorded in 2 Corinthians, when the apostle was eager to meet Titus, or the later visit (Acts xx. 6), when he was on his way to Jerusalem; and accordingly the fragment has been assigned, in whole or in part, to an imprisonment at Cæsarea or at Rome, or at least to some period subsequent to the Ephesian ministry. Here, however, we are able to make use of the conclusion to which we were led in our chapter dealing with the apostle's relations with Corinth, viz. that on a previous occasion he had set out to go to Macedonia, proceeding indeed as far as Troas, when he modified his plans so far as to fit in an emergency visit to Corinth. We can imagine that at Troas he received information, brought, I believe, by Titus, which showed him that a visit to Corinth was an immediate necessity. While deciding therefore to pay this visit, he still intended to return as soon as possible to resume his plans for evangelistic work at Troas (cf. the reference to 'the gospel' in 2 Cor. ii. 12) and in Macedonia. Accordingly he left behind him the cloak (the time was summer, as we infer from his intention to leave Ephesus after Pentecost) and the parchments, for he was not likely to require either of these articles on a hurried journey of this kind, and they could conveniently be picked up on his return.

The visit to Corinth was marked by acute pain and humiliation, and he returned to Asia. From what we know of it we may gather that it was of quite brief duration, and the probability of this is confirmed by a phrase in the letter to Timothy written shortly after he returned, in which he refers to the approach of winter (2 Tim. iv. 21). Instead, however, of crossing to Troas, he decided to return via Miletus. Why he did so we can only conjecture. Was it merely a case of taking the first convenient boat? Did Jewish plots make a change of route desirable on this as on a later occasion (Acts xx. 3)? Had he received disquieting news regarding the spread of false teaching in Colossæ and neighbourhood? While any or all of these factors may have entered into the situation, we have possibly to recognise that the apostle was at this time confronted with a danger which threatened not merely the churches in the Lycus valley but indeed his whole work throughout the province. It is highly probable that after the apostle's departure his Jewish adversaries in and around Ephesus attempted in a new and more insidious way to accomplish the overthrow of the Christian movement by undermining the faith of its adherents. That there was an outburst of propaganda definitely directed towards that end is indicated by repeated references to false teaching throughout the letters to Timothy, the names of certain leaders, Alexander, Hymenæus, and Philetus, being specified in connection with it (1 Tim. i. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 17). Was it as a result of this propaganda that when Paul did return to Asia he found himself deserted by 'all the Christians of Asia' except Onesiphorus (2 Tim. i. 15 f.; cf. iv. 16)? Was even Timothy himself attacked and imprisoned during his master's absence (cf. the interesting reference to his 'release' in Hebrews xiii. 23)? In any case, if

a violent anti-Christian movement of this kind was proceeding during the apostle's absence in Europe, we can imagine how at Corinth he decided that there was no other course open for him but to proceed at once to the scene of danger and meet the enemy face to face.

Paul accordingly returned to Asia. At Miletus the faithful Trophimus, a native of Ephesus, who had probably accompanied his master to Corinth as later he did to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4, xxi. 29), had owing to illness to be left behind. The apostle advanced inland, making straight, as I believe, for the Lycus valley, where he was ultimately attacked and brought into court. The chief instigator of the trouble was Alexander the smith, no doubt the anti-Christian Jew who had previously acted as spokesman for his co-religionists at Ephesus (Acts xix. 33) and whose sinister influence had now spread to the more remote parts of the province, while at Ephesus it was still, as Timothy is reminded, a danger to be guarded against. The whole atmosphere surrounding the apostle was intensely hostile: all those on whose support he might have reckoned turned away from him (2 Tim. i. 15), and at his first defence he stood alone. Seldom, if ever before, had he faced so serious a danger; it was (as he wrote to the Corinthians shortly afterwards, 2 Cor. i. 8) as if his last hour had come. But instead of death came deliverance, a deliverance so remarkable that, like Daniel (Dan. vi. 20, 27) and the Psalmist (Ps. xx. 21), he felt he had been delivered from the lion's mouth. At the time of writing now to Timothy he is possibly still under surveillance, but we see him facing the future with a serene and confident faith. Drawing strength from the prayer which his Lord had taught His disciples to pray, he rests his soul on One who is able to 'deliver us from the evil,' whose is 'the kingdom' (cf. ver. 18),

and 'the power' (cf. ἐνεδυνάμωσέν in ver. 17), and to whom in reverent exaltation he ascribes 'the glory for ever and ever. Amen' (2 Tim. iv. 18).

(2) As regards Timothy

Timothy is in Asia, probably in Ephesus or near it. He is asked to beware of Alexander. Greetings, too, are sent to Prisca and Aquila, whom we know to have been in Ephesus with Paul, and to the house of Onesiphorus, who likewise had been in Ephesus (2 Tim. i. 18). With this agrees the fact, vouched for in 1 Tim. i. 3, that (probably on his return from his visit to Philippi promised in Phil. ii. 19 and referred to in Acts xix. 22) Timothy was asked to superintend the churches in Asia during the apostle's absence in Macedonia and Greece; and, thanks to our reconstruction of the apostle's journeys to Corinth, we are able to regard this period of supervision as beginning before the sorrowful visit to Corinth and not on the later occasion of the apostle's advance to Macedonia recorded in 2 Corinthians.

We see, then, Timothy established at Ephesus at the time when Paul sets out to Macedonia. The responsibility is a serious one, all the more so as the apostle has no intention of returning to resume work at Ephesus. In a word of friendly encouragement he tells Timothy (1 Tim. iii 14) that he hopes to see him soon—he is possibly thinking of a passing visit on the way to Jerusalem; but in the meantime his work must take him to other fields—firstly to Troas, which he had had to pass by on an earlier occasion (Acts xvi. 8); then to Macedonia, where on his earlier visit he had done little extensive work throughout the province, such as a prolonged stay of two or three years had subsequently enabled him to

accomplish in Achaia and Asia ; and finally in Corinth, where he knew many difficulties awaited him. All this he knew would take time ; hence in his first letter after his departure he took occasion to remind Timothy that, despite the hope he entertained of seeing him soon, some delay might intervene before his return and that therefore he, as the apostle's deputy, must not shirk the responsibility which so long an absence cast upon his shoulders.

Paul proceeded, as we have seen, via Troas to Corinth, retiring from there to Miletus and probably advancing to Laodicea. There he encountered fresh trouble, and he wrote again to his faithful lieutenant, asking him to come and join him. It was, we may believe, the first news he had been able to send to Timothy for some time, possibly since he had left Troas to pay his sad visit to Corinth. Many things had happened in the interval, notably the fresh outbreak of hostility which had occasioned the apostle's arrest ; and though through the reports of friends Timothy would have received some information about those recent happenings, it is plain from the way in which Paul alludes to them (*a*) that Timothy had not been with him at the time of the trial, and (*b*) that Paul had not seen him since. All this is perfectly in harmony with the general reconstruction we have suggested, whereas (as indicated in an additional note, p. 208) insuperable difficulties emerge if, assigning the letter to a date before the sorrowful visit, we attempt to explain (*a*) where Paul is when he asks Timothy to come and join him ; (*b*) why he should ask Timothy to join him so soon after he had left him as superintendent in Asia ; and (*c*) why he should only now inform him of events connected with the trial when he must surely have seen Timothy in the interval, viz. at the time when he left him behind in Asia.

(3) As regards the other references in the fragment

We have postulated that, on leaving Ephesus some months before he wrote the present letter, Paul had gone north to Troas, where, owing to news of disaffection at Corinth, he suddenly changed his plan of tour and proceeded on a special mission to Greece. This not merely enables us to explain the reference to the cloak and the parchments, but sheds light on the movements of at least two of the apostle's companions, Demas and Titus ; and here we may note in passing that, though Timothy had no doubt heard at the time of Paul's change of plan, it would not be till he received the present letter that he heard of some of the consequences brought about by that change. Demas, who had been with Paul in Ephesus during the second imprisonment following the riot, had naturally, as a native of Thessalonica, accompanied his master on the journey which was intended to lead to Macedonia ; but now that, as the news from Corinth indicated, further trouble was in store for the apostle and the advance to Macedonia was temporarily delayed, Demas abandoned his master and took the straight road home. With regard to Titus, there is reason to believe (p. 218) that he had been at Corinth during the period immediately preceding this, and he may therefore have been the bearer of the news from Corinth which led to the apostle's change of plan. When, on hearing this news, the apostle determined to proceed in person to Corinth, there was obviously no need for Titus to return there, and so he was sent to prosecute some of the evangelistic work in and around Macedonia which his master had himself planned to undertake at this time ; and more especially, being eager as ever to extend the

work to 'the regions beyond' (2 Cor. x. 15) and with his eye ever set on the way that led towards Rome, Paul now sent him, from Macedonia, along the *Via Egnatia* to pioneer in Dalmatia.

A word may be added regarding Paul's other companions. Of Crescens's mission to Galatia (or, according to another reading, to Gaul) we know nothing—there is no reason to connect it with the trouble revealed in Paul's Galatian Epistle, which almost certainly belongs to a much earlier date. Luke, who had been with Paul in Ephesus (Col. iv. 14) is still with him, but his work was no doubt that of a secretary and travelling companion, not an evangelistic agent or a deputy, and he is not free now, any more than earlier (Phil. ii. 20), to be employed as Timothy and Mark might be. Tychicus had some months before been sent to visit the churches in the Lycus valley (Col. iv. 7) and is perhaps still in that region; in any case Paul now sends him to take Timothy's place at Ephesus. It may even be permissible to infer from the word ἀπέστειλα, 'I have sent' or 'I am sending,' that Tychicus was with Paul at the time of his dispatch. This would corroborate the view that Paul now writes from Laodicea. When Colossians was written, there was a possibility that Mark might visit the Lycus valley ('if he come,' Col. iv. 10); evidently that possibility had not been realised at the time, and now Timothy is asked when he comes to bring Mark with him. Aquila and Priscilla are still at Ephesus: they had been there along with Paul, and we also find them there at the time when Rom. xvi. (addressed, as we believe, to Ephesus) was written. Erastus, as we have seen, had gone westwards with Timothy from Ephesus to Macedonia (Acts xix. 22); perhaps, however, he alone had gone on to Corinth, where Paul would have seen him at the time of

the sorrowful visit, and now Timothy is informed that he is staying on there (ver. 20).

In the above discussion I have purposely said nothing with regard to the closing greetings in 2 Tim. iv. 21. Of the friends whom the apostle mentions there we know nothing for certain. The occurrence of Latin names (Pudens, Claudia) is interesting, but provides no argument for a Roman origin of the letter. Even apart from 'Cæsar's household' and those who were associated with 'the prætorium,' there would be many in the province who bore Latin names; and it may be that among such non-Asiatic members of the church there was a tendency to remain loyal to the apostle when, under the influence of Alexander and his friends, the Asiatics as a whole turned away from him. We may add that the names confirm our contention that the place from which Paul writes is not Ephesus; for among those who send greetings here and those to whom the apostle sends greetings in Rom. xvi. (addressed, we believe, to Ephesus) there is no name in common.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON 2 TIMOTHY IV. 6–22

Anyone who has attempted to reconstruct the situation behind the varied references in 2 Tim. iv. 6–22 will realise how intricate and baffling the problem is, especially if he eschews the over-easy solution of dividing up the note into separate fragments; and in the preceding pages I have been more concerned to point the way towards a solution than to dwell on the difficulties to be overcome. Among those difficulties there are two that specially deserve mention.

i. *Do vers.* 6–8 *and* 9–22 *form a Unity?*

At first sight there seems to be one grave objection to linking up vers. 6–8 with the succeeding verses, 9–22, viz. the apparent contradiction between the apostle's certainty of martyrdom in ver. 6 and his assurance of delivery in ver. 18. We may of course fall back on the explanation that in the latter case he is thinking merely of a 'spiritual salvation'; but that is not wholly satisfactory, for the ἵνα clause in ver. 17 (note especially the significant language about the preaching of the gospel *accomplishing its full course* and *all the heathen world hearing it*) most naturally means that, having been miraculously delivered, the apostle now sees opening out before him again the great work of world-evangelisation to which he had been called at the beginning, and which, during this latest crisis, he had feared was prematurely to be cut short.

As contrasted therefore with vers. 6–8, with their thought of the race that is ended, vers. 17, 18 breathe the confidence of a man who knows that his work is not yet finished, and who hears again the call to action sounding in his ears.

> "Death closes all: but something ere the end,
> Some work of noble note, may yet be done,
> Not unbecoming men that strove with Gods."

In view of this there has been a tendency to separate the two sections (taking, it may be, ver. 21, or the latter part of it, and ver. 22 with the earlier section vers. 6–8), and to regard vers. 9–20 (21*a*), whether as a whole or as a collection of fragments, as interpolated before the final greetings of the other section—an interpolation which would have been facilitated by the similarity in the wording (σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν) of vers. 9 and 21*a*.

Apart, however, from other objections which might be raised, there is an inherent improbability in such a scheme of division and sub-division, and it may be questioned whether the difference in tone between vers. 6–8 and vers. 9–22 is sufficient to justify us in regarding them as separate fragments. For example, it has been far too readily assumed that vers. 6–8 necessarily imply that the apostle is facing the prospect of almost immediate death.

(*a*) In this connection we may remember that as a Roman citizen Paul stood in no immediate danger from the adverse verdict of a provincial court. If he had been writing now from a Roman prison, his words might have been interpreted as the reflections of a victim awaiting his doom ; but if, as I think preferable, he was now in Asia, he knew well that, however violently his enemies might attack him, there stood between him and a decree of execution the right of appeal to Rome.

(*b*) Be that as it may, however, his Roman citizenship would have been no protection against plotters and assassins ; and even as regards a more judicial form of attack, he knew that he was dealing with enemies whose lust for his blood would not allow itself to go for ever unsatisfied. In the most recent crisis they had all but succeeded, as their intended victim clearly recognised : he had been delivered from the lion's mouth (2 Tim. iv. 17), brought back as it were from the dead (2 Cor. i. 8–10). But almost at the same moment as he rejoices in his deliverance Paul is able also to look facts in the face and to recognise that, baulked as his enemies have been on this occasion, they will some day succeed in bringing him to his death. This is the thought to which he gives expression in vers. 6–8 ; only let us note that he does so, not in a mood of spiritual

despondency or as one who, languishing in prison, is helplessly awaiting his end, but rather as one who, even in the midst of all his hopes and endeavours, has been led by a recent terrible experience to see as in a vision the fate which has now begun to lay its hand upon him.

(*c*) And if we ask why Paul, despite his sense of deliverance in ver. 17, dwells here on the prospect of death, the answer is to be found in the context. He is writing to a youthful and (it would seem) over-sensitive and timorous deputy, seeking to awaken in him a sense of responsibility and to prepare him generally for the work which awaits him. In the preceding verses (if they are genuine) he has urged Timothy to preach the word, in season and out of season, remembering that the time will come when men will not endure sound doctrine and will turn away their ears from the truth; and in ver. 5 he goes on to say: "Whatever happens, be self-possessed, flinch from no suffering, do your work as an evangelist, and discharge all your duties as a minister" (Moffatt). Is it any wonder that in ver. 6 he proceeds to enforce this appeal by a very pointed reminder (in the Greek there is an emphatic contrast between *you* and *I*) that the time has come when he himself must be sacrificed, and that when he is gone Timothy must be ready to step into the breach.

Our general conclusion therefore with regard to vers. 6–8 is that there is no sound reason why we should not link them up closely with the section which immediately succeeds. If we do so, then they belong to the period of the third, and apparently the most serious, of the attacks made upon Paul during his ministry in Asia, the occasion being his return to Asia after the sorrowful visit to Corinth.

Some little time, therefore, must have elapsed between this letter and the Epistle to the Philippians, with which we have found (pp. 190 f.) affinities in the language and thought of vers. 6–8. No difficulty need be felt on that score. Affinities of language provide in themselves no precise argument for identity or even proximity of date. We are, however, justified in believing that the ideas and images common to the two letters may have had a special appeal for the apostle during those tragic years at Ephesus when, despite the greatness of the task confronting him, he found himself faced every day with death ; and he may often have employed them in conversation with his intimate friends. Behind the use of σπένδομαι in Phil. ii. 17 and 2 Tim. iv. 6 there may be a reminiscence of a quotation : ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι is an iambic dimeter.

ii. *The Relative Positions of Paul and Timothy*

There is real difficulty in understanding the precise relations of Paul and Timothy at the time of writing. One of the problems here is that the request made to Timothy to bring the cloak and parchments left at Troas has generally been taken to imply that Troas lies in the route which Timothy would traverse when he came to join the apostle. We have shown on p. 198 that this assumption is erroneous—all that need be implied is that Timothy should arrange for the articles to be sent to him, and that he should then bring them with him when he proceeds to join the apostle. But to those who assume that Timothy must pass through Troas the general situation has naturally presented itself under one or other of these two aspects—either (*a*) Paul is in Asia, and Timothy is in Macedonia ; or (*b*) Timothy

is in Asia, and Paul has recently passed through Troas on his way to Macedonia or Greece. Under (*a*) we may attempt to link up this visit of Timothy to Macedonia with the visit promised in Phil. ii. 19 and recorded in Acts xix. 22; but little progress can be made along that line, and we turn therefore to (*b*) as offering a more probable reconstruction.

In an interesting article on 'Pauline Readjustments' in the *Expositor* for June, 1924, and subsequently in a little book with the same title (Williams & Norgate, 1927), T. W. Llynfi Davies proposed this line of interpretation, seeking to connect this fragment with 1 Timothy rather than with 2 Timothy, and linking up the present advance of Paul through Macedonia with that referred to in 1 Tim. i. 3; but his attempt at reconstruction lacks precision in detail, and it does not come to grips sufficiently with the difficulties. In what follows we shall pursue the hypothesis for ourselves, connecting it with some of the conclusions which we have established in the earlier part of our inquiry.

At first sight it is quite tempting, in view of the strong assurance expressed in vers. 17, 18, to believe that Paul is now a free man, advancing to new conquests, and that the voice which speaks to us in this little note is that of the eager evangelist, not that of the condemned victim. If in vers. 16–18 he wishes Timothy to know how serious was the danger which had recently threatened him, he goes on to tell how the Lord had delivered him, evidently because there was work still waiting for him to do. As contrasted therefore with vers 6–8, with their thoughts of the race being ended, vers. 9 ff. represent the apostle as once again a free man with the open road before him. Timothy is summoned to join him, not to be a solace in the hour of death (the language

of vers. 6–8 would scarcely imply that he could be expected to arrive in time), but rather to take a place in the new line of advance. It is because he is εὔχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν (to undertake, shall we say, some missionary service, and not merely to wait on a helpless prisoner) that Mark's presence too is required. It is possible therefore that in vers. 9 ff. we have a fragment of a separate letter quite distinct from the letter of which vers. 6–8, with probably 21*b*, form a part.

With regard to the apostle's advance via Troas and Macedonia, the question naturally arises whether we are to connect this journey with that referred to in 2 Corinthians. To this there are insuperable objections, among which we may note in passing the difficulty of believing that Titus can have been sent off to Dalmatia (ver. 10) between the time of his joyous meeting with Paul in Macedonia and his dispatch back to Corinth as the bearer of 2 Corinthians, and also of understanding why Timothy (in Asia) should only now hear of that defence of Paul's which must have taken place (also in Asia) some considerable time previously. Some of these objections, however, notably that concerning Titus, are met if, making use of the reconstruction we have adopted regarding Paul's route on the occasion of the sorrowful journey to Corinth, we believe that it is to that journey that the information given in 2 Tim. iv. ought to be referred.

Even on this latter reconstruction, however, difficulties still beset us at every point.

(*a*) With regard to the apostle.

Where was he and what were his general circumstances when he sent this letter to Timothy? Can we imagine him, either in Macedonia (if he proceeded there) or in Corinth, summoning Timothy, whom he had left so

short a time before as superintendent at Ephesus, to do his best to come now to join him ? This is a difficulty which is not to be got over by imagining that some considerable time has elapsed between Paul's departure from Ephesus and the writing of the letter ; for the longer we make the interval the more difficult it becomes for us to explain why he should now, apparently for the first time, convey information to Timothy regarding a trial which had taken place some time before.

(*b*) With regard to Timothy.

We have already (p. 205) pointed out that the information now communicated to Timothy with regard to the first defence suggests both that Timothy had not been with Paul at the time of the trial and that even since then Paul had not had an opportunity of telling him about it. Now, with regard to the occasion of this trial, we have shown (p. 192) that the whole situation behind the present fragment rules out all possibility that the reference is to the first Ephesian imprisonment during which Philippians was written. Neither can the reference be to the later imprisonment associated with the Demetrius riot and the writing of Colossians ; for though, it is true, Timothy was probably not at Ephesus at the time of the riot (p. 139), and may therefore have had no personal knowledge of what happened at the time of the first defence, he returned to Ephesus in time to be with the apostle at a later stage of the same imprisonment, for his name is associated with his master's in the writing of the letters to the Colossians and to Philemon. Paul had therefore abundant opportunity to tell him about the earlier stages of the trial before he set out on his present journey to Macedonia.

There is no satisfactory way out of this impasse. We may of course sacrifice the unity of the letter. Or

we may fall back on the view that in vers. 16–18 Paul is not so much informative as reflective and reminiscent—his object is not to tell Timothy something of which the latter has no previous knowledge; it is rather to utter a warning and to speak a word of encouragement. But neither of these solutions is in the least probable; and we conclude that in 2 Tim. iv. both Paul and Timothy are in Asia, the latter at Ephesus, the former perhaps at Laodicea.

CHAPTER XV

THE PERSONAL REFERENCES IN THE EPISTLE TO TITUS

ANOTHER important fragment in the Pastoral Epistles that calls for examination is Titus iii. 12–15, in which, *inter alia*, the apostle urges Titus, when Artemas or Tychicus has arrived to take his place, to meet him at Nicopolis, adding that he himself has made up his mind to spend the winter there. Here at the outset we may admit that the data at our disposal, far scantier than in the case of the passage from 2 Tim. iv. 6–22, allow of nothing more than a problematical reconstruction. Nevertheless it will be illuminating to inquire how far in the movements of Paul and his companions as we have already sketched them there are any occasions into which this fragment can be appropriately fitted.

An earlier part of the Epistle to Titus refers to Titus's residence in Crete (i. 5); and it is not impossible that Titus may at some time have visited that island, though we know of no occasion on which the apostle can have 'left' him there, *i.e.* if by 'left' we assume that the apostle had been there with him for a time before passing on elsewhere. So far, however, as concerns the fragment we are now considering, it is possible that there, as in the 2 Timothy fragment, we may discount the traditional setting, and in that case, if we may assign the two fragments to approximately the same period, there are good reasons for believing that Titus may at this time be resident in Corinth.

2 Corinthians has various references to Titus's connection with Corinth at this period. He was present when the sorrowful letter arrived, and may even (though I prefer to think otherwise) have been the bearer of it. The most natural interpretation of 2 Cor. viii. 6 attributes to Titus the initial steps in organising at Corinth 'the collection for the saints,' and we learn from 2 Cor. viii. 10, ix. 2 that definite preparations to carry out this scheme had been made at Corinth *ἀπὸ πέρυσι*, *i.e.* in the year preceding that in which 2 Corinthians was written. It can scarcely have been that, as some have urged, Titus initiated the collection-scheme when he went to Corinth as bearer of the sorrowful letter: the reference to 'last year' would then be less natural, and such an occasion would have been singularly inopportune for so delicate a piece of business. An earlier occasion would seem to be indicated. The first steps in organising the collection would probably have been made about the time when 1 Corinthians arrived (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 1 ff.): and Titus's presence in Corinth may therefore go back to that date. He is not likely to have been there much earlier, for he is not referred to in 1 Corinthians. Such information, too, as is given regarding the collection in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 ff. is clearly to be supplemented in some more personal way. May it therefore have been that Titus was the bearer of 1 Corinthians?[1]

Regarding the date of Titus iii. 12 ff. it is at least clear that, if it belongs at all to the period now under discussion, it is subsequent to 1 Corinthians. For 1 Corinthians was written some time before Pentecost, and an injunction to Titus to come on to Nicopolis about winter time would, if issued earlier than this,

[1] Many of the points referred to in this paragraph are discussed more fully in Chapter XVII.

have been premature. There was nothing unnatural in the apostle's informing the Corinthians at that early date that he might possibly be able to reach them before winter, but it would have been quite unnatural for him so early in the year to give instructions to one of his lieutenants about joining him next winter.

Two possibilities accordingly fall to be considered; the winter referred to in Titus iii. 12 may be either (*a*) that of 55–6, following the Pentecost which was to mark Paul's departure from Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 8), or (*b*) that of 56–7 preceding the Pentecost which Paul kept at Jerusalem. In this latter case, as we gather from Acts that the journey to Jerusalem took some seven weeks, and that Paul had previously spent three months in Corinth (Acts xx. 3), he must have arrived at Corinth about January; but his plan of wintering at Nicopolis may have been fulfilled so far as the earlier part of the winter was concerned. A third possibility, that Paul may have arrived in Corinth for this final visit in the January succeeding his departure from Ephesus, so that there is only one winter to be considered, breaks down on closer scrutiny.[1] In examining the two

[1] We may note three reasons against this hypothesis:

(1) Paul cannot then have devoted much time to that missionary crusade in Macedonia which had figured so largely in his plans at the time of setting out, and which he knew to be so necessary in view of the limited nature of the field covered on his sole previous visit to that province.

(2) It is hard to see how, in addition to this work in Macedonia, time can be found for the sorrowful visit to Corinth, with possibly a visit to Illyricum, and his arrival at Nicopolis before winter.

(3) Titus's movements would now become incapable of explanation. If, as we have supposed, he met the apostle at Troas and went on from there to Dalmatia, how was he to get back from Dalmatia to Corinth in time to bring news from there to Paul of the reception of the sorrowful letter?

possibilities (*a*) and (*b*), we shall accept the itinerary for which I have argued on pp. 176, 201, viz. that on leaving Ephesus about Pentecost 55 Paul set out to go to Macedonia, and that it was shortly after this that the sorrowful experience took place at Corinth.

Before we come to weigh the relative merits of these two rival hypotheses, there are two other New Testament references that call for our consideration, namely, the reference to Dalmatia in 2 Tim. iv. 10 and that to Illyricum in Rom. xv. 19.

Now, with regard to the first of these two passages, 2 Tim. iv. 10, we can assert with some confidence that the dispatch of Titus to Dalmatia must belong to a different period from that of his joyous meeting with Paul subsequent to the sorrowful letter. The picture given in 2 Corinthians will scarcely allow us to believe that between the time of Titus's arrival and his subsequent dispatch back to Corinth (probably as the bearer of 2 Corinthians and to complete the work of the collection) Titus has been made to fit in a visit to Dalmatia.

Further, let us see what bearing Rom. xv. 19 has upon Titus iii. 12. The very selection of Nicopolis as a possible wintering-place sheds light on Paul's *previous* movements. Nicopolis, situated on the west coast of Epirus, would be a wholly unnatural place for Paul to make for in a land-journey between Philippi and Corinth. It was, however, easily approached by sea. Shall we, then, say that previous to coming to Nicopolis Paul had been in Illyricum, and that, proceeding southwards from there on his way towards Corinth, he spent the winter at Nicopolis? Titus iii. 12 ff., summoning Titus to come to Nicopolis, would be written from Macedonia or from Illyricum.

The general picture which results is that Paul, having finished his work in Macedonia, made his way along the *Via Egnatia* to Dyrrachium, that there was a period of evangelistic work, which need not have been extensive or prolonged, in Illyricum; from there, as winter approached, he sailed south to Nicopolis, and in course of time he came to Corinth. The possibility that this visit to Corinth may have been the sorrowful visit is, of course, ruled out for us at once if we care to fall back on the hypothesis which has already played a large part in our reconstruction, viz. that that visit was suddenly embarked on from Troas. Suppose, however, that as a means of testing the general truth of our reconstruction we examine the question now under discussion without reference to that hypothesis. What we have therefore to consider is: (*a*) may the visit to Corinth, which succeeded the meeting of Paul and Titus at Nicopolis, have been the sorrowful visit? Or (*b*) was it the final visit recorded in Acts xx. 2? To introduce dates—was the winter spent at Nicopolis that of 55–6, or that of 56–7? Or, to consider the problem with reference to Titus, did he perhaps go on to Dalmatia from Nicopolis, or did his visit to Dalmatia precede, perhaps with an interval, his coming to Nicopolis?

What light, if any, is shed on this question by Titus's mission to Dalmatia? That mission cannot have been undertaken at the time of his appearance in Macedonia recorded in 2 Corinthians (p. 220), and is best to be explained if placed somehow before Paul's sorrowful visit to Corinth. Hence on view (*a*), Titus, having been summoned by the apostle to meet him in Nicopolis, is subsequently sent on to Dalmatia to develop a new piece of work which in the immediately preceding period his

master had hurriedly initiated. He thus spends in Dalmatia the winter which Paul spends at Nicopolis. On view (*b*), Titus's work is not to confirm but to explore, and it is as a result of this pioneering mission of his lieutenant that the apostle himself pays a visit to that region in the following summer or autumn. Taken generally, either of these situations might seem a reasonable possibility, though more detailed examination, as we shall see, tells decisively in favour of the latter.

And with regard to Paul's visit to Illyricum, into which of the two settings does it fall most appropriately? If, having left Ephesus about Pentecost, Paul visits first Macedonia, then Illyricum, and arrives at Nicopolis before winter, clearly he cannot have devoted much time to his beloved Macedonians. It is true that, when he wrote 1 Cor. xvi., he had envisaged the possibility (it was nothing more) of reaching even as far as Corinth before the winter set in, and now he finds he cannot get beyond Nicopolis. Still, the compression of events suggests that when he formed the plan outlined in 1 Cor. xvi., *either* he did not intend on that occasion to visit Illyricum and Nicopolis, *or*, if he did intend to explore these parts (and his use of διέρχεσθαι in 1 Cor. xvi. 5 suggests that he meant this tour to be an occasion for extensive work), then he cannot have meant on this occasion to make a prolonged stay with the already existing churches of Macedonia. Yet, considering the fact that his work in all the Macedonian churches had, on his first visit, been cut short by persecution, that he had often (as he once wrote to the Thessalonians) wished to come back, and that for the Christians in that area he had a specially warm affection, is it likely that, when at last an opportunity of visiting them presented itself, he would

have contented himself with seeing them merely in passing? If he did merely pay them a flying call, he must in passing on have had the deliberate intention of coming back, *i.e.* after visiting Corinth. It is true that the picture of the Macedonian situation given in 2 Corinthians suggests that Paul had so far not made much, if any, headway in Macedonia with the collection-scheme, and consequently that any visit to Macedonia on that occasion cannot have been of long duration. Does not all this point unmistakably to the double conclusion, (i) that he did not go to Macedonia at all, his intention to do so having been changed at Troas; and (ii) that the sudden decision not to proceed meantime with the work in Macedonia was caused by the necessity of pushing on at once to Corinth, and not by a call to undertake evangelistic work in a distant area like Illyricum? Thus as between the two reconstructions there is no question that we must accept that which refers the Illyricum and Nicopolis visits to the second of the two journeys between Asia and Corinth.

Setting out the two journeys so as to see the relative positions, at each stage, of Paul and Titus, we have:

(1) On view (*a*)—

Paul leaves Ephesus.	Titus is in Corinth.
,, arrives at Troas and, it may be, at Macedonia.	
,, goes on to Illyricum.	
,, goes to Nicopolis.	,, comes to meet him.
,, winters in Nicopolis.	,, goes on to Dalmatia.
,, has sorrowful experience at Corinth.	
,, hurriedly leaves Corinth.	,, probably returns to Corinth to take Paul's place.
,, writes sorrowful letter.	,, is present at Corinth when it arrives, and brings to Paul news of its reception.

(2) On view (*b*)—

Paul leaves Ephesus.	Titus is in Corinth.
,, arrives in Troas.	,, joins him at Troas with news of the Corinthian situation.
,, proceeds to Corinth earlier than he had intended.	,, goes along Via Egnatia to Dalmatia.
,, has sorrowful experience at Corinth and leaves hurriedly.	,, returns to Corinth.
,, goes to Troas and Macedonia.	,, meets him in Macedonia.
,, writes 2 Corinthians.	,, returns to Corinth.
,, goes on to Illyricum.	
,, comes south to Nicopolis.	,, meets him at Nicopolis.

View (*b*) is certainly the right one.

We may find corroboration for the above reconstruction in the language of 2 Cor. x. 15 ff., where Paul, writing from Macedonia at a time when, instead of coming on direct to Corinth, he is about to set out on an evangelistic visit to Illyricum and ultimately to Nicopolis, tactfully says that the present improvement in his relations with Corinth will, he hopes, leave him free to do other work that is calling him : " My hope is that the growth of your faith will allow me to enlarge the range of my appointed sphere and preach the gospel in lands that lie beyond you." Incidentally I may say that I see no good reason for taking 2 Cor. x.–xiv. as part of the sorrowful letter, and indeed an argument against that hypothesis may be found in the very fact that x. 15 as above interpreted fits so much better into the context of the final visit to Corinth than into that of the sorrowful visit.

A brief word will suffice for the other personal references in the fragment. Of Artemas and Zenas the lawyer we know nothing apart from their mention here. Tychicus had already shown himself a trusted servant during the

difficult days of the Ephesian ministry—"a beloved brother and a faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord" is how he is alluded to in Col. iv. 7. At the time of the trouble at Colossæ he has been entrusted with a special mission to that church and the other churches in that neighbourhood. Later, during the third (as I believe) of the apostle's imprisonments in Asia, he had been given the still more onerous commission of relieving Timothy at Ephesus (2 Tim. iv. 12). And now, as the following winter approached, Paul had him in mind as a possible substitute for Titus in the difficult situation (by this time fortunately much less difficult than it had been) at Corinth. Apollos has evidently visited Corinth in fulfilment of the intention announced in 1 Cor. xvi. 12; and he is now proceeding elsewhere.[1] Titus is enjoined to give him and his travelling-companion a hearty send-off, and generally to see that all attention is paid to them. May we gather from this, and from the strange reference to 'our people' in ver. 14, that Paul recognises the need for tactfulness in his dealings with this fellow-missionary, and that at Corinth there was still some measure of distinction between those who were 'of Paul' and those who were 'of Apollos'? Though strongly discouraging 'parties,' Paul could not but recognise that they existed; and here he shows his concern that those who ranged themselves with him should be men of Christian character and should not be without fruit (ἄκαρποι) in their lives. May there also be behind his words the implication that those who ranged themselves with Apollos tended to be more concerned with Christian γνῶσις (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 1) than with Christian character?

[1] No indication is given in the Greek (contrast the English Authorised Version) that he is proceeding towards Nicopolis.

Part 4

THE COLLECTION FOR THE SAINTS

CHAPTER XVI

GOVERNING IDEAS BEHIND THE COLLECTION

DURING this period Paul's mind was much occupied with what he calls in 1 Cor. xvi. 1 'the collection for the saints.' Here we have a clue which from its very concreteness and from the variety of references to it in the Epistles may well serve as a useful means of testing the general truth of our proposed reconstruction.

Our evidence regarding the collection is to be gained almost solely from the Epistles. The one clear reference to it in Acts (xxiv. 17) is contained in Paul's apologia before Felix: 'After an interval of several years I came up (*i.e.* to Jerusalem) with alms and offerings for my nation.' We may, however, read in Acts xx. 35 (in the address to the elders of Ephesus) an indication that during his stay in Ephesus the apostle had emphasised the Christian duty of assisting the poor; Acts xx. 4, too, though it does not refer in any way to the collection, gives a list of Paul's travelling companions according to the localities they represent, and it is generally felt that they are deputies from the various churches appointed to carry the collection to Jerusalem.

The earliest reference we have in Paul's Epistles is that of 1 Cor. xvi., written as we believe shortly before the sorrowful visit. The collection is said to be 'for the saints.' But who these saints are, the Corinthians are not told—a clear indication that this is not the first intimation they have received of the scheme. We learn

something more definite from Romans xv. 25 ff. (written shortly afterwards, during Paul's final visit to Corinth)—the collection, to which Macedonia and Achaia have contributed, is for the poor among the saints in Jerusalem; and with this we may connect the evidence of Acts xxiv. 17 : ' alms for my nation.'

Of the circumstances which called for such a scheme of relief, and of the persons who were to benefit from it, we know nothing more for certain. We may, however, recall how at an earlier date a famine had raged in Judæa, according to Acts xi. 29, and Paul and Barnabas had taken to Jerusalem a contribution from the first of the Gentile churches, that of Antioch; and Gal. ii. 10, which the present writer would connect with the same episode, tells how the Jerusalem apostles had asked Paul to remember the poor. Since then the spread of Christianity among the Gentiles had gone on apace. Not merely in Antioch, but in Asia, in Macedonia, in Achaia, new congregations had sprung into being; and among the many problems that confronted the apostle in the building up of these new communities in Christian faith and life, he saw the necessity for inspiring them with a vital sense of their spiritual unity in Christ, and of forging for them some practical bond which would link them up closely, not merely with one another, but also with the mother-communities in Judæa.

Thus we are led to see, in part at least, Paul's motive for organising the collection. The soul of the apostle must have been stirred to its depths as in city after city of the pagan world he saw new communities arising under the power of the Spirit of Christ; yet all the more urgently was the question forced upon him whether these communities were to seek completeness in isolation

or whether in Christ their *religio* was to bind them together. For himself, Paul's own conception of the Christian *ecclesia* allowed only one answer to that question; but it was no easy task in such a matter to get the Christians of Ephesus or of Corinth to share his vision and his faith. Judaism, though its adherents were dispersed among the heathen, had its concrete symbols of unity in the Law of Moses, and in the Temple on Mount Zion; and the prophets of old in their vision of a world-salvation had pictured how the Gentiles would yet say one to another, "Come and let us go up to the hill of Jahweh; for out of Zion shall go forth His law, and the word of Jahweh from Jerusalem" (Isaiah ii. 3; Mic. iv. 2). And Paul was as passionate a believer in the ingathering of the Gentiles as was Isaiah: but how were Christians, for whom the Law and the Temple had lost their binding force, to realise in practice that unity which in theory linked Jew and Gentile together in Christ?

The apostle's mind had all along been alert to this problem, and to the danger inherent in it. At Antioch he had withstood any tendency that would have made it difficult for Jews and Gentiles to sit down together at one table. At Corinth he was now finding that believers were forming themselves into coteries, as if the various preachers who had instructed them in the faith were so many sophists seeking each a following for himself. How easy, too, it was for each congregation to regard itself as an independent organisation, bound by no special tie of interest or of duty to Christian brethren elsewhere, and indifferent to the vision of a Christian *Imperium* no less real and far more glorious than that of Rome.

But the most insidious form of the danger was that

which threatened to isolate his Gentile congregations in the Dispersion from the original congregations in Judæa. Here the danger revealed itself in two ways. In the first place, now that in so many Greek cities the Christian congregation, predominantly Gentile, had no connection whatsoever with the Jewish synagogue, there was a disposition on the part of many Gentile-Christians to keep themselves as separate as possible from the Jews, between whom and themselves there was often a wall of prejudice, rivalry, and hatred. Gentile-Christians in those Græco-Roman cities were not likely to reflect that the spiritual blessings in which they had been made partakers had come to them through the Jewish-Christians of Palestine (cf. Rom. xv. 27). And, secondly, if the heathen communities were loath to recognise any tie as binding them to the Jewish-Christians in Judæa, Judæan Christians on their part were strongly averse to recognising the adherents of these upstart Gentile-Christian communities as full members in the new Israel, the new people of God. The vision of Jahweh's world-wide empire might fill the soul of Paul as earlier it had filled the soul of Isaiah ; but the vision of the prophet is rarely shared in its fullness by the people, and in Christian circles in Jerusalem there must have been many who, despite the concordat of the Jerusalem Council, had no great sympathy with the free admission of Gentiles and grudged to share with such the ancestral privileges of their nation. No doubt, too, there were others, still Jewish at heart more than Christian, whose dullness of vision readily begat credulity, slander, and bitter hostility, so that in the apostle to the Gentiles they came to see, as their non-Christian brethren urged them to see, not merely a fanatic but a traitor to his nation and his religion,

and to refuse to accord to his so-called Gentile-Christians the right of membership in the same 'body' as themselves.

Such were some of the features in the situation which confronted Paul when he set himself to organise the collection on behalf of the poor Christians in Judæa. Many of the Jewish-Christians there were no doubt people of humble circumstances; and their lot would be made harder if there was a tendency on the part of their non-Christian fellow-countrymen, who would always be in the majority, to have as few dealings with them as possible. The necessity for assisting them, which had been recognised in the days before the Jerusalem Council, was now much more acute. Hence, if Gentile-Christians, who in general enjoyed a greater measure of financial security, could be induced to come to the aid of their Jewish-Christian brethren in Judæa, a practical demonstration would be given at Jerusalem of the unifying bond of Christianity, the suffering Jewish-Christians would receive the assistance and encouragement of which they stood so much in need, and even the Gentile-Christians would benefit by having their vision enlarged, their sense of brotherhood developed, and their Christian liberality increased. Realising too as he did how tragically his own position was misjudged and misrepresented at Jerusalem, not least among Jewish-Christians, Paul must have nursed the hope that the zeal he displayed in furthering the collection might lead his traducers to recognise how essentially loyal he remained to his nation and his nation's faith.

Behind the collection-scheme there was one other governing idea, to which we had occasion to refer in our discussion of the charge of temple robbery (p. 42). Adult Jews and Jewish proselytes throughout the world

were accustomed to pay an annual tax for the upkeep of the Temple at Jerusalem. Now, however loyal he might be to the essentials of the Jewish religion, Paul could not countenance the view that Gentiles who became Christians should be made liable to pay this tax, and even in the case of Jewish-Christians their sense of obligation could scarcely fail to be lessened when once they came to believe that the Temple (like the Law) no longer possessed that unique and abiding significance which formerly they had ascribed to it. Jews and Gentiles alike were taught to see that the God and Father of their Lord Jesus Christ had found for Himself a new Temple in the hearts of believers, and more particularly in the corporate fellowship of His saints; but this new Temple, though growing daily before their eyes, was still far from being complete, and they must all assist according to their ability in the work of construction and expansion. Of the various schemes in regard to which Paul solicited the support of his churches, some were more definitely directed to the work of spreading the gospel; here in his scheme of 'the collection for the saints' his aim was rather that Christians should share the need of their fellow-Christians. Naturally there could be no question of demanding contributions in the form of a tax. As we see emphasised in 2 Cor. viii. and ix., these contributions must be a free gift; the collection is to be a *διακονία*, an exhibition of *κοινωνία* and of *χάρις*.

Paul apparently regarded these collection-contributions, as the Jews regarded the Temple tax, as 'first-fruit' offerings, *ἀπαρχαί*, and so he determined that they should be taken to the Temple in Jerusalem and offered up as a solemn sacrifice from his Gentile churches at a time when normally the first-fruits were offered, viz. the

Feast of Pentecost. Further, he did not wish that the responsibility of taking them to Jerusalem should be left to himself alone, and indeed at one time it was an open question whether he would go at all (1 Cor. xvi. 3, 4). Official delegates must be appointed, just as they were in connection with the transmission of the Jewish Temple tax. In this case each delegation would represent the churches of its own provincial area, *ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν* (2 Cor. viii. 23), officially appointed by them and bearing letters of authority (1 Cor. xvi. 3). A list of such delegates is preserved for us in Acts xx. 4.

CHAPTER XVII

THE ORGANISATION OF THE COLLECTION

We now proceed to examine in detail the circumstances of the organisation of the collection. It was some time after the visit to Jerusalem referred to in Acts xviii. 22 that Paul took the matter in hand, and though we have no evidence on the point, it may have been certain experiences on that occasion that moved him to do so. But if it was *then* that he conceived the scheme, some little time was to elapse (except conceivably in the case of the churches of Galatia) before he was able to put it into execution. This delay was occasioned by the misfortunes that overtook him in Ephesus.

i. *Galatia*

From 1 Cor. xvi. 1, which is the earliest reference to the collection in the Epistles, we learn that the scheme had already been laid before the churches of Galatia. Had the apostle done so personally when he passed through Galatia on his way back from Jerusalem (Acts xviii. 23)? It is true that from two to three years had now elapsed since that visit; but in view of the unexpected interruption to his work in Asia the delay in proceeding with the scheme elsewhere need not surprise us. The only feasible alternative is that Paul may have sent a deputy; for he certainly would not have initiated a matter of such importance merely by letter, and there is no reason to postulate that he himself paid an inter-

mediate visit. The question does not seem to be a vital one ; but if we can think that it was at Jerusalem that Paul caught his enthusiasm for the scheme we may well imagine that he would take the first opportunity to put it into operation, and that he therefore submitted it to the Galatian Christians during the visit recorded in Acts xviii. 23.

Nothing more is known for certain regarding the Galatian collection. In 2 Corinthians reference is made to the progress of the scheme in Macedonia, not in Galatia ; but there was less occasion to remind the Corinthians of the progress of the work in Galatia, for Galatia was remote from Corinth, whereas there was a rivalry between Corinth and Macedonia. Those who refer Galatians to this period find an obvious and significant reference in Gal. ii. 10 ; but on our view that Galatians was written before the Council of Jerusalem the consideration there shown for 'the poor,' while providing a seed from which the later collection-scheme may have germinated, takes us back to the time when Barnabas and Paul conveyed relief from the brethren at Antioch to the churches of Judæa (Acts xi. 29 f.). Crescens's visit to Galatia (2 Tim. iv. 10) may, however, have been connected with the furtherance of the collection. And if the names given in Acts xx. 4 are those of collection-delegates, Gaius and perhaps Timothy (though Timothy was more than the representative of his home church : hence perhaps the omission of any local designation with his name) represent Galatia.

ii. *Macedonia*

Arguments from silence must be precarious ; but we cannot ignore the fact that in Philippians no mention is

made of the collection. If that letter is, as we have argued, anterior to 1 Corinthians, it may be that at the time of writing the scheme had not yet taken definite shape in the apostle's mind. Much more probably he had been thinking of it for some time (compare what we have said above with regard to the initiation of the scheme in Galatia), but so far he had had no opportunity, either personally or by deputy, of laying it before the Philippians. Epaphroditus, who presumably was the bearer of Paul's letter to the Philippians, could not of course be asked to undertake a task of such delicacy. If the matter was to be entrusted to a deputy at all, that deputy would have to be in the fullest sense an accredited legate of the apostle's (Epaphroditus was rather a legate of the Philippians : cf. Phil. ii. 25). In 1 Corinthians, written shortly after Philippians, there is still no reference to the prosecution of the scheme except in Corinth and Galatia, whereas by the time that 2 Corinthians was written appeals to the example of Macedonia are frequent. In the initiation of the scheme in Macedonia we look therefore to this intervening period.

An opportunity for laying the scheme before the Macedonian churches would seem to have been provided by the visit of Timothy, accompanied (according to Acts xix. 22) by Erastus, who seems to have had gifts as a financial administrator (Rom. xvi. 23). That Timothy did initiate the scheme in Macedonia is, however, nowhere stated (though his name appears in the list of Acts xx. 4 there is nothing there to associate him specially with Macedonia) ; and whether Erastus stayed to take any part in this work in Macedonia, or proceeded at once to Corinth (2 Tim. iv. 20) we cannot say. Something may have been done in the matter by Aristarchus (who also is mentioned in Acts xx. 4) if, as I have ventured to

suggest (p. 196), he had left Ephesus to go on to his native Thessalonica.

But when we come to examine the evidence of 2 Cor. viii. and ix., we can see there no good ground for believing that Macedonia had taken up the scheme, or at least made any real progress with it, before the arrival of Paul himself. The language of ix. 2 may indeed be taken to imply that Corinth had begun its preparations a year (or part of a year) earlier than Macedonia, which is only now beginning to press forward with the work. Further, the Macedonians are said to have acted in this matter on their own initiative (*αὐθαίρετοι*), and even to have begged insistently for permission to participate in the scheme (viii. 4)—from which we may infer that though the apostle or one of his deputies must have taken the opportunity of making the Macedonians acquainted with the scheme, yet he had in no sense pressed it upon them, influenced no doubt by the fact of their 'deep poverty' (viii. 2). If it is thought unlikely that Timothy, going to Philippi as the apostle's deputy, had not been instructed to take preliminary steps in this matter just as some other deputy (Titus ?) had been instructed to do at Corinth, it still seems to be the case that, whatever the reason,[1] it was not till the arrival of the apostle himself that the scheme was successfully taken in hand.

But more important than the question of the part played by Timothy is the other fact that here emerges, viz. that if, as we have argued, the apostle set out to go through Macedonia on the journey that culminated in the sorrowful visit to Corinth, he apparently accom-

[1] Timothy's visit may of course have been cut short by a summons to rejoin the apostle. But if this summons came during a second Ephesian imprisonment, sufficient time had elapsed since his arrival for the scheme to have at least been mooted. Was Timothy less successful than Titus as an organiser ?

plished little or nothing on that occasion with regard to the collection in Macedonia. And from this we may argue that, though he had meant to do evangelistic work in Macedonia before going on to Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 5), something happened which either prevented his going to Macedonia at all on that occasion or at least cut short his stay there. We connect this with what we have already suggested on p. 181, that somewhere *en route*, perhaps at Troas, Paul received news which made him alter his plans and push on earlier than he had intended to Corinth.

We gather from Acts xx. 4 that among the party which conveyed the collection to Jerusalem were two Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus—an indication of the zeal with which Thessalonica had taken up the scheme. It would be strange, however, if there were two representatives from Thessalonica, and not one from Philippi. May it be that the Philippians had asked Luke, who seems to have had an intimate connection with their city and who was moreover attached to the apostle in another capacity, to act as their official collection-delegate? If so, we can understand why in his account of the party Luke modestly omits all reference to himself except by the unobtrusive introduction of the first personal pronoun in xx. 5.

There is a further reference to the Macedonian delegation in 2 Cor. viii. 18–24, for, writing as the apostle is at this time from Macedonia, we can scarcely doubt that the churches whose delegates are there referred to are the churches of Macedonia. Proud of the progress which the Macedonian churches have made with the collection, and eager that the Achaian churches should be stirred to emulate their example, Paul asks two Macedonian representatives to accompany Titus to Corinth while he

himself spends some months in evangelistic work in other fields—shall we say Macedonia, Illyricum, and Nicopolis? They are, he says, *ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν*, official delegates bearing a commission from the churches which they represent (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 3), and one of them is described in some detail as "the brother whose praise is found throughout all the churches for his services to the cause of the gospel, and who moreover has been appointed by the churches to travel with us (*συνέκδημος ἡμῶν*) in connection with this benefaction which is being administered by us to the glory of the Lord." There is probability in the tradition which sees in this a reference to Luke, especially if Luke was, as we have suggested, the official representative of the Philippian church; and that being so, the other brother who is to accompany him will probably be the Thessalonian representative, Aristarchus. The term *συνέκδημος*, used with reference to the first-named of the two brethren, is applied in Acts xix. 29 to Aristarchus and Gaius; but no safe argument for identification can be built on that, for *συνέκδημος* does not necessarily imply a financial delegate—it means nothing more than a travelling-companion, and it could be appropriately applied to any of those who went from place to place with Paul in connection with his missionary work.

The reference in Acts to Aristarchus and Gaius as *συνέκδημοι Παύλου* suggests, however, one further reflection. If we accept in Acts xix. 29 the reading *Μακεδόνα*, which implies that only Aristarchus was a Macedonian, then Gaius may be the same as the Gaius of Derbe referred to in Acts xx. 4, so that both of the men who are called *συνέκδημοι Παύλου* in Acts xix. 29 did as a matter of fact become collection-delegates. As the Demetrius riot on our reconstruction took place quite

near the end of the apostle's Ephesian ministry, Gaius may already have been commissioned by the Galatian churches (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 1, written some months previously) to give special heed to the organisation of the collection; but this can hardly have applied at this date to Aristarchus, seeing that Macedonia did not take up the scheme till later. We prefer therefore to think that at the time of the riot Aristarchus and Gaius were with Paul in the capacity of missionary-assistants appointed by their respective churches (cf. p. 151), and that it was in virtue of their work accomplished in that capacity that they were later commissioned to act as collection-envoys. Had Demas remained faithful, he too would probably have become a collection-delegate from the Thessalonian church; as it was, his place was taken by another, Secundus. And, to return to Aristarchus and Gaius, it was probably their active association with the apostle as missionaries,[1] rather than any possible connection at this date with the work of organising the collection, which made them specially obnoxious to the Jews of Ephesus, exposing them to the baseless charge of being temple robbers and so drawing down on them the violence of the Ephesian mob.

iii. *Achaia*

We come now to examine in greater detail the progress of the scheme in Achaia, with special reference to Corinth. The earliest reference to Corinth's participation is given in 1 Cor. xvi., where the apostle submits an arrangement for weekly contributions. Not a word is added by way of explanation or commendation of the scheme: clearly the Corinthians are assumed to

[1] Aristarchus would moreover as a Jewish-Christian (Col. iv. 10 f.) incur the special hatred of the Ephesian Jews.

know who ' the saints ' are, and why Achaia like Galatia should be expected to contribute to their support; and so we can say with certainty that they have other information of the scheme beyond that which is provided here. Something of course may have been said (though from the nature of the case we can have no evidence of this) in the lost letter referred to in 1 Cor. v. 9; but a matter of such significance and delicacy was not likely to have been dealt with merely by letter, and so (as we have no reason to believe that the apostle had revisited Corinth before the writing of 1 Corinthians) we may conclude that he had entrusted the sponsoring of the scheme to a deputy. Who was this deputy likely to have been? The evidence of 2 Corinthians points strongly towards Titus. We may note in passing that the absence of any reference to Titus in 1 Corinthians makes it doubtful if he was already in Corinth when that letter was dispatched. The suggestion naturally presents itself that Titus may have been the bearer of 1 Corinthians and that he was expected by a personal presentation of the scheme to supplement the information conveyed in the letter. Such a reconstruction is probably not far beside the mark, though if this were Paul's first communication on the subject we should have expected him to state his own views with greater explicitness and enthusiasm; and the probability is that, while Titus may have been commissioned to sponsor the scheme, the apostle had also presented his case in a letter not now extant. As regards date, the evidence of 1 Cor. xvi. suggests that the collection was initiated at Corinth approximately in the early part of the year 55.

We turn next to the evidence of 2 Corinthians. Paul is clearly anxious about the progress of the scheme in Corinth, and in chapters viii. and ix. he presses the

Corinthians to make headway, and tells how he is sending Titus and other delegates to supervise the work. His manner of dealing with the topic is not free from difficulty —the two chapters show overlapping and lack of cohesion: one would not guess from the introductory words of ix. 1 that the previous chapter had dealt with the same theme. Accordingly attempts have been made to separate the two chapters—not, however, too successfully. It is not impossible, of course, that chapter ix. may represent a 'fly-leaf,' intended for separate circulation among the churches of Achaia.[1] But in any case the general situation behind the two chapters is practically if not completely identical, as is evidenced by the references in both to 'the brethren' who are to accompany Titus (viii. 18 ff.; ix. 5) and to the preparations which were made 'last year' (viii. 10; ix. 2).

Of special significance for our present inquiry are the references in viii. 6 and ix. 2. In the former of these we are told, in language which it is scarcely possible to misunderstand, that it was Titus who had initiated the collection in Corinth. "We have asked Titus that,

[1] Chapter viii., it may be noted, is written in the plural, and chapter ix. in the singular. Again, in chapter viii. the apostle tactfully seeks to make the zeal of the Macedonians an incentive to the Corinthians: in chapter ix. he spurs on the Corinthians by reminding them that their initial enthusiasm in the matter had been held up before the Macedonians and they must not now belie the expectations that have been formed. Chapter ix., on the other hand, has certain special features not in chapter viii.: *e.g.* in ver. 4 it refers to the possibility that representatives of Macedonia may come to Corinth with the apostle, and it goes on in vers. 5–15 to urge strongly certain religious reasons why the scheme should be prosecuted with vigour; and on these grounds it may not unreasonably be held that chapter ix. is complementary to chapter viii. and need not be dissociated from it. The undefined reference to 'the brethren' in ix. 5 is only intelligible in the light of viii. 18 ff.

as he had previously made a beginning, so he should bring to completion among you this good work also." Some writers have questioned what it was that Titus had previously begun. To that there can surely be only one answer. When we reflect on the obvious solicitude with which Paul here approaches this difficult question of the collection, and how his thought at this point is wholly concentrated on it, can we possibly imagine, in the absence of any clear indication to the contrary, that the task (unspecified) which Titus had formerly taken in hand is different from the 'good-work' (viz. the collection) which he is now expected to finish? Is not this to fly in the face of the obvious meaning of words? The only justification that can be urged for distinguishing the earlier task from the later one is the introduction of the word *καί* before *τὴν χάριν ταύτην*. But the real implication of *καί* is, not that the work which Titus had then begun is to be distinguished from that other, viz. the collection, which he is now to try to complete, but that the collection (begun by him some time ago and now about to be completed) is not the only good-work in Corinth which Titus had to his credit. What other good-work can Paul be thinking of? We cannot doubt that here, as in those passages in chapters ii. and vii. where he refers with deep emotion to his young colleague, he has in mind the part which Titus had played (at the time of the sorrowful letter) in establishing more cordial relations between the apostle and the Corinthians.

As viii. 6 indicates the *agent* in the scheme's inauguration, so ix. 2 sheds light on the question of its *date*. "I have been boasting of you," says Paul, "to the Macedonians, and telling them that Achaia had completed its preparations last year." A good deal of dispute has

occurred regarding the precise significance of *ἀπὸ πέρυσι*, found here and in viii. 10. Taken strictly the phrase signifies ' last year,' and not (as A.V. and R.V.) ' a year ago ' (R.V. in ix. 2 has ' for a year past '). It is hard to say when Paul would have regarded the new year as beginning: it may have been in autumn, it may have been in spring; and if, as is not unlikely, 2 Corinthians was written some time in the summer of 56, *ἀπὸ πέρυσι* might well refer to any time in the preceding twelve months, or perhaps even a little earlier. The phrase *παρεσκεύασται ἀπὸ πέρυσι* need not be taken to imply more than that last year *preparations* were completed—the scheme, *i.e.*, was thoroughly launched: in view of all the circumstances, it is unlikely that Paul could have allowed himself to believe that at so early a date the collection was completed and that Corinth had raised its full share. Clearly, as is shown by the appeals of chapters viii. and ix., and by the necessity for the mission of Titus, even as regards preparations Paul's confident boast had not been justified by events; but for our present purpose the phrase ' last year ' indicates vaguely a date at which the scheme had already been before the Corinthians for sufficient time to enable them to carry out their preparations. The first mooting of the scheme would go back to a date probably a few months earlier. From this verse we may infer that approximately twelve months, it might be rather more, had elapsed between the initiation of the scheme by Titus and the writing of 2 Corinthians.

The attempt has been made to connect Titus's initial sponsoring of the scheme with the only previous visit of Titus of which we have direct evidence in the epistle, viz. the visit which immediately preceded his meeting with the apostle in Macedonia, when he brought news of

the reception of the sorrowful letter.[1] But there is one serious difficulty to such a reconstruction. Relations between the apostle and his Corinthian congregation were at that time strained almost to breaking-point. He had recently had to leave Corinth, pained and humiliated. If this was the time when Titus was charged with the duty of organising the collection, a less auspicious occasion could scarcely have been chosen—and that no matter whether Titus was, or was not, the bearer of the sorrowful letter. True, if we knew of no other possible occasion to which we could refer the previous mission of Titus, we might argue (as Menzies does in his commentary on the epistle : *Introduction*, p. xxiii) that " it is the business of a church director to see that disturbances in the feelings of a church shall not, if it can be avoided, interfere with its good works nor bring them to a close." But we should still have to recognise the *prima facie* improbability of the hypothesis ; and we are faced further with the evidence of 1 Cor. xvi., indicating that the beginnings of the scheme in Corinth are to be connected with an earlier period, viz. that immediately following the receipt of 1 Corinthians. Why, then, should we not believe that Titus's initial attempts to organise the collection go back to that earlier time ? No difficulty is created in the way of this hypothesis by the references to the beginning which had been made in the previous year : for though, unlike some commentators, the present writer believes that a winter intervened between the writing of the two great epistles to Corinth, still if the writing of 1 Corinthians (and with it the initiation of the collection-scheme) is assigned to the early months of 55, and the writing of 2 Corinthians to the summer of 56, it would be still quite natural for the apostle to

[1] Among recent editors, Lietzmann and Menzies hold this view.

refer in the letter to the beginning which was made last year.

Some time, then, in the summer of 56 Titus returned to Corinth, bearing the Second Epistle and commissioned by Paul to take in hand once more the organisation of the Corinthian collection.[1] About January of the following year the apostle himself arrived, and after a three months' stay he set off so as to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost. In the list of those who accompanied him on that journey no mention is made of any representatives from the churches of Achaia. Does this mean that, after all, the apostle's worst fears regarding the Corinthian collection had been realised, and that when the time came for the money to be sent off the Corinthian contribution was too small to justify the sending of a collection-delegate?

iv. *Asia*

If by the end of his Ephesian ministry Paul's thoughts were set on promoting the collection in the churches of Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia, what progress did he make with the scheme in Ephesus itself and in the other churches of Asia? That something was accomplished is indicated by the presence of two Asiatics, Tychicus and Trophimus, among the collection-delegates mentioned in Acts xx. 4. But it is noteworthy that in the epistles of this period no reference whatever is made to the progress of the scheme in Asia. That this is so in 2 Corinthians need not surprise us, for the frequent appeals made there to Macedonia (and not to Asia) are naturally explained by Achaia's proximity to, and jealousy of, the northern

[1] There is no doubt that the aorists in 2 Cor. viii. 17; xii. 18 refer, not to a mission which is now in the past, but to one which is about to be undertaken: 'Titus is setting out to go to you'; 'I have asked Titus, and with him I am sending the brother.'

province. Difficulty, however, has been felt regarding the omission of any reference to the scheme in Colossians, and this omission has been used as an argument against assigning that epistle to the Ephesian period. To meet that difficulty we have only to remember that the church at Colossæ was still in an undeveloped state, and Paul had too much good sense and missionary-statesmanship to solicit support for such a scheme before he had had an opportunity of visiting Colossæ personally and of explaining to the congregation the ideals which the scheme embodied. At Corinth, where he had two years' missionary work behind him, he might leave the sponsoring of the scheme to his able envoy Titus ; but even in Macedonia little, if anything, was done until he himself appeared on the scene. Paul would not lay the scheme before the Colossians till the time was ripe for doing so.

It goes without saying, however, that Paul must have expounded the scheme to the Christians of Ephesus and have solicited their co-operation. And, as we have argued, it was perhaps due to his zeal in this matter and to the success attending his efforts that there burst upon him the first storm of Jewish opposition, when he and his colleagues were accused of temple robbery (cf. the apparent reference in Acts xix. 37 to a charge already disposed of). A critical situation ensued ; the apostle was flung into prison and, as we may gather from Philippians, his life seemed for a time to be in danger ; and though the crisis passed, it is obvious that the scheme must have received a serious set-back, and in any subsequent efforts to promote it Paul would feel the necessity of exercising tactfulness and restraint. This simple fact may explain why in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, when he refers to injunctions issued to the churches of Galatia, he omits any reference to his plans for the prosecution of the scheme in Asia.

Part 5

THE OPPOSITION TO PAUL

CHAPTER XVIII

THE MAIN TENDENCIES OF THE OPPOSITION TO PAUL

FROM our study of Paul's movements and missionary activity we turn to review the opposition which his activity inevitably aroused. Here we shall have to examine afresh the various epistles (including the Imprisonment Epistles) which we regard as belonging to this period of Paul's ministry, and to consider how far their evidence yields a picture whose elements harmonise with one another and with what we know of the opposition from other sources, *e.g.* from Acts. But before proceeding to this more detailed inquiry it will be well to trace what I consider to have been the main lines along which this opposition developed.

i. *Before the Council of Jerusalem*

Such opposition as Paul encountered before the Council of Jerusalem made itself felt, in the main, *within* the Christian Church. Judaism tolerated Christianity so long as it did not fear it. It did not fear a Christianity, such as apparently predominated at Jerusalem during the greater part of those fifteen years after the Crucifixion, which, while indulging in fantastic views about the Messiahship of the crucified Jesus, was content to be loyal in all essentials to the Jewish faith from which it had sprung. It feared Stephen, however, just as it had feared Jesus ; and it feared him because of the deductions which he drew from the new faith,

viz. that in Jesus Christ God had revealed Himself in a way *which superseded all previous revelations*, so that, *inter alia*, the Law and the Temple had no longer that final validity which they had in the eyes of the orthodox Jews. And so they stoned him. When Paul arose, drawing deductions similar in all essentials to those of Stephen, they sought to kill him too; and had he remained in Jerusalem or near it, they might well have fulfilled their purpose. But for the next thirteen years (Gal. ii. 1) Paul's sphere of activity lay far from the Holy City where even to the Christians he remained a stranger, and perhaps his work during most of this time was directed mainly to propagating the new ideas among his Greek-speaking fellow-Jews.

During this period, therefore, the Church enjoyed comparative immunity; but there was still suppressed suspicion and even hatred, ready at any time to burst out into a flame; and behind the violent measures adopted by Herod against two of the Galilean leaders, James, whom he beheaded, and Peter, who escaped from prison, we may no doubt trace the hidden hand of the Jewish ecclesiastical rulers. In course of time Christianity began to make definite and perhaps unexpected headway among the Gentiles at Antioch, and the development was such that Barnabas and his young assistant Paul took the opportunity of consulting regarding it with the leaders of the Jerusalem church. Their arrival would seem to have been before the Herodian persecution, as Peter, according to Gal. ii. 9, was still in Jerusalem, and the Antiochean development, however interesting to the Christian leaders, had perhaps not yet begun to excite the jealous interest of the Jewish ecclesiastics. There were some, however, among the Jewish Christians in the Holy City who looked with anything

but favour on the inclusion of Gentile members within the fellowship of the Church except on well-defined conditions; and however sympathetically the case for freedom may have been received by James, Peter, and John when Barnabas and Paul conferred with them informally on the matter, there remained within the Jerusalem church a party strongly opposed to the merging of Jew and Gentile in the one fellowship of Christ; and the activities of this party are to be traced both in Antioch, where, on the arrival of delegates from Jerusalem, Peter and even Barnabas developed some hesitation in sitting at the one table with Gentile Christians, and in the newly founded churches of Galatia, where Jewish-Christian propagandists sought to impose fresh demands on the Gentile converts.[1]

This was the situation that necessitated the holding of the Jerusalem Council of Acts xv. It was a situation which was bound to be watched with the keenest concern by the Jewish leaders *outside* the Church, and the sympathy and support of their non-Christian co-religionists was no doubt sought by many *within* the Church, who regarded themselves as Jews first and Christians afterwards and to whom therefore the new development was anathema. But primarily the quarrel was a domestic one within the Christian community. It was a striking testimony both to the convincing power with which Barnabas and Paul presented their case and to the extent to which the Spirit of Christ had already permeated the Jerusalem church, that despite the binding force of tradition in their own ranks and the bitter hostility which, as they knew, the free inclusion of Gentiles would evoke

[1] In this reconstruction Galatians is regarded as having been written before the Apostolic Council of Acts xv.

among their non-Christian brethren, the members of the Council decided that Gentile-Christians were not to be asked to accept the demands of the Law as a necessary condition of salvation. The decision might at once have precipitated a crisis had not the Council, under the wise leadership of James, also decided that the Gentiles should be asked to abstain from certain practices[1] which, if indulged in, would cause abhorrence among Jews, whether Christian or non-Christian, and render fellowship impossible. Thus a rupture between Christianity and Judaism, which perhaps the more far-sighted on both sides were beginning to see was bound to come sooner or later, was staved off, at least for the present.

ii. *After the Council of Jerusalem*

By the decision of the Jerusalem Council Paul had won from the leaders of the Jerusalem church a recognition that in Christ Gentiles were fellow-heirs with Jews (and that without circumcision and the full acceptance of the Law) in the one redeemed family of God the Father. So far, therefore, as the official policy of the Church was concerned, Jewish-Christianity, in the narrow sense of a Christianity that demanded that Gentiles could enter the Church only by first becoming Jews, received what was virtually its death-blow. But this did not mean that the struggle was over: it only meant that it was now to enter on a new phase.

Even within the Church it did not follow that all Jewish adherents tamely accepted and loyally adhered to the policy to which Paul had succeeded in committing the leaders. There were many (their influence is to

[1] Viz. sexual impurity, and the use as food of things offered to idols, of blood, and of the flesh of animals that had been strangled.

be traced in Paul's correspondence of the years that followed) who in this matter were die-hards—to them the Law was a divine revelation, whose demands, though they might be supplemented, were on no account to be set aside ; and in the Temple at Jerusalem they saw the God-appointed centre of worship for the new faith as for the old. There were others who, reluctantly admitting that the Gentile who wished to become a Christian should not be asked first to become a Jew, were concerned that the Jew who became a Christian should not, under the influence of Gentile associations, denationalise himself and become practically a Gentile (cf. Acts xxi. 20 f.). Further, behind the conservatism and the fears of a scrupulous Jewish-Christianity there began to manifest itself all the vigour and the virulence of non-Christian Judaism. Driven to see that the new policy of the Church contained a definite challenge to the religion of the Law and the Temple, the ecclesiastical leaders in Jerusalem soon came to lay toleration aside. They had been willing to look with complacency on a Christianity which, despite its facility in winning adherents, remained true (as it seemed) to the main essentials of the old faith ; but when the Church stood committed to the policy of offering the privileges of God's holy people to uncircumcised Gentiles on the sole condition of faith in Jesus Christ, the more eager and intolerant spirits in the nation rose in active opposition.

Thus during the period of his ' second ' and ' third ' missionary journeys Paul became increasingly the victim of Jewish opposition, recruited partly from within the Christian Church, but even more from without it. It was some time before this opposition, in so far as it was organised from Jerusalem, made

itself felt. In Macedonia the fanaticism of the non-Jewish populace suggests that there the main cause of hostility (cf. p. 20) was that the missionaries were looked on as revolutionary Jews of a type from which both Jews and pagans were eager to dissociate themselves—though, of course, the excessive bitterness of the Thessalonian Jews may also be explained in some measure by opposition to the apostle's liberalising attitude with regard to the Law. In Corinth, however, the situation underwent a change. There neither the populace nor the civic authorities showed any marked hostility to the work of the apostle. There were many Gentile converts. The main opposition was Jewish, and (as the Corinthian Epistles show) these opponents included Jewish-Christians who had come from without, it may be from Jerusalem. A close study of the Corinthian situation reveals the pernicious character of this opposition and the extent of its ramifications.

It was partly in the hope of vindicating himself in face of his nation that, at the conclusion of his stay in Corinth, Paul shaved his head as a Nazirite and proceeded to Jerusalem to keep the feast. By the time of his residence in Ephesus the opposition had become even more insidious, and, as we have tried to show in earlier chapters, the attacks made on the apostle in the Asian capital were far more serious than has generally been recognised. When, at the end of the Ephesian ministry and following a short period devoted to Macedonia and Achaia, Paul returned to Jerusalem, it was with the knowledge that his enemies were now ready to do their worst with him. He was arrested, and on being brought to trial was denounced with such fierceness and persistency that, had the accused not been a Roman citizen, a complacent procurator might well have fol-

lowed the example of Pilate and allowed Jewish intolerance to work its will. But, though it was naturally at Jerusalem that Jewish fury against the apostle was most violent and had the most favourable opportunity for accomplishing its end, still it is clear that the effort put forward there was the culmination of many years of unrelenting persecution in the provinces, where apparently Roman justice stood between it and its victim. And it was at Ephesus that that previous persecution manifested itself in its most malevolent and dangerous form.

iii. *Various Manifestations of Hostility*

The opposition which we have traced in the previous section manifested itself in various ways.

(*a*) *Social persecution.*—We may note first of all that not merely the apostle but Christians generally would be made the victims of hostility, at least in places where orthodox Judaism was predominant. There would be a tendency on the part of non-Christian Jews to ostracise their brethren who had become Christians. Even in the Diaspora this social persecution would make itself felt—we have frequent references to such persecution in 1 Peter, and we need not think that it was a new occurrence at the time when that epistle was written. In communities that were predominantly Gentile, however, the persecuted Jewish-Christians would find new bonds of fellowship with their Gentile brethren in Christ. The case was quite different in Jerusalem and throughout Palestine and Syria. It is true that in this case a great number, like those 'thousands' referred to by James (Acts xxi. 20), would keep themselves right with their non-Christian brethren by the zeal they displayed for the essentials of the old faith; yet there must also have been not a few who, like Paul, could say that for the

gospel's sake they had suffered the loss of all things. If boycotting was practised on a large scale it was bound to lead in many cases to acute distress, financial and otherwise. It was out of such a situation that the need arose among Judæan Christians which Paul sought to meet by his 'collection for the saints.'

(*b*) *Attacks on the apostle's person.*—Deliberate and persistent attacks were made not merely on the work but even on the life of the great apostle to the Gentiles. Paul was clearly marked out as the arch-renegade who by his pernicious influence was disrupting the nation. The Jerusalem church as a whole might seem to be behind him—at the Council it had proclaimed the truth of his gospel and given him its blessing, and some of the leaders were admittedly sympathetic with his views; but the driving force in the movement, apart from whom it would soon come to a stop, was seen to be Paul, and Paul alone. And it was not merely that he admitted to the fellowship of God's people individual Gentiles (as Peter had done in the case of Cornelius) who cared to apply for membership; the unforgivable crime of which Paul was guilty was that he was a missionary to the Gentiles, and that with feverish energy he went forth into all the highways and byways of the Gentile world and compelled them to come in. There was nothing for it but to bring his career to an end. And so history began to repeat itself. What had happened to Jesus must happen now to the apostle. As in the earlier days spies and plotters appeared in Galilee, so now they appear in Ephesus and Corinth (Acts xx. 3, 19); and when the time came for him to go to Jerusalem, Paul, like his Master, went 'bound in the spirit' (Acts xx. 22) to meet there an opposition which would not be content till it had compassed his destruction.

(*c*) *Systematic propaganda.*—Apart from attacks made on the life and liberty of the apostle, systematic propaganda was undertaken so as to undermine his influence in the various Gentile churches. Religious bigotry can allow itself to say and do terrible things against those who move too fast for it, and Paul suffered from it more than most. The real force behind the persecution and slander which assailed him was of course Jewish in origin, but when we call it Jewish we must recognise that it might quite well, and in many cases certainly did, manifest itself in the Jewish section of the Christian Church. Thus, according to Acts xxi. 20 f., Jewish-Christians at Jerusalem had been informed and were willing to believe that Paul went about through the Diaspora teaching Jews to break off from allegiance to the Mosaic Law, and to give up the rite of circumcision and the various customs by which as a nation they preserved their unity. And with regard to the spread of misrepresentations in the apostle's Gentile churches, it would seem to have been the case that here too the main agents were Jewish-Christians. Non-Christian Jews in any particular city might indeed set themselves by such means to detach from their new allegiance their Jewish brethren who had become followers of Paul; but undoubtedly the attempt to destroy Paul's influence in his various churches was accomplished mainly by those who were themselves Christians, but who in their Christianity refused to share the liberal outlook of the apostle to the Gentiles. There is no doubt, for example, that the ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι (2 Cor. xi. 5) who about the time of Paul's Ephesian ministry found an entry into his Corinthian congregation, and whose pernicious influence calls forth such heated denunciation in 2 Corinthians, were Jewish-Christians (2 Cor. xi. 13, 23).

These attacks on the apostle and on his work took many forms, some of them far from honourable.

(1) It was asserted that Paul was not a genuine apostle of Christ. Originally one of the cries of the old Judaistic party in the period preceding the Council of Jerusalem, the question of Paul's apostleship was again raised by the new Judaisers who, bringing letters of commendation with them from Jewish-Christian leaders, claimed that they were more in touch with the traditions of the faith, and more entitled to the designation 'apostle,' than Paul was. There is abundant evidence of this in 2 Corinthians. May we suggest that it was on this account that, as in Galatians (at the time of the earlier conflict), so now in all but one of the public epistles of this period Paul in his opening salutation proudly asserts his apostleship,[1] generally with the addition of the phrase 'by the will of God.'

(2) Direct attacks were also made on Paul's teaching. At Corinth we can see that the 'extra-apostles' were not content merely to dispute Paul's apostleship and to encourage slanders about him; they also set themselves to present their own form of Christianity in opposition to his. From 2 Cor. iii. we may gather that they insisted that even in Gentile-Christianity there must be a place for the Mosaic Law. Their plea probably was not (as their predecessors had contended before the decision of the Apostolic Council) that keeping of the Law was

[1] This applies to 1 and 2 Corinthians, ~~Ephesians~~ and Colossians, Romans, 1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus. The exception is Philippians. If we ask why Paul does not assert his apostleship in that letter, perhaps it is sufficient to say that attacks on his apostleship had not yet begun, at least at Philippi. Philippians is the earliest letter of the group; and further the language of Phil. iii. 2 ff. makes it plain that the menace of Jewish-Christian propaganda was there an anticipated rather than an actual danger at the time of writing.

essential to salvation, but rather that a permanent validity attached to the revelation given under 'the old covenant'; and Paul opposed their contention by developing a contrast between a religion of the letter and a religion of the spirit.

A reference to false teaching is to be found in Rom. xvi. 17 f., which was written shortly after the Ephesian ministry. The false teachers against whom Paul here warns his readers are clearly Christians, but they have not grasped the spiritual implications of the faith and are more interested in 'plausible and pious talk' than in sound doctrine. A similar situation lies behind the Pastoral Epistles, and whatever theory may be held regarding the origin of those documents it is more than likely that in the churches which Timothy and Titus were called to supervise there was at this time much trouble caused by unsound and unspiritual teaching. The teaching which we have here in mind was of course Jewish in origin and was definitely directed against the liberal theology of Paul. When we come to consider the evidence of the Imprisonment Epistles (p. 270), we shall see a warning against such teaching in Phil. iii. 2 ff., and the question will be raised whether the false teaching of Colossians falls into the same category.

(3) Baseless insinuations were spread against the apostle's personal behaviour and character. Thus at Corinth he was accused, *inter alia*, of ἐλαφρία, lack of serious interest (cf. p. 173), of worldly-mindedness (2 Cor. i. 12), of 'walking according to the flesh' (2 Cor. x. 2); and there was one special insinuation which from the point of view of our inquiry deserves rather special consideration. His enemies alleged that he feathered his own nest, and made money out of the gospel.

The question of ministerial support is ever a difficult

one, and it is clear that Paul had given to the matter much careful thought and was punctilious in the attitude he adopted with regard to it. From the time he came to Europe he seems never to have accepted money from any church until after he had left it, or (it may be) was devoting himself to definitely extensive work in outlying parts of the field. The principle may indeed have been adopted earlier, for on the occasion of the earlier missionary journey to Cyprus and the South Galatian cities Barnabas and Saul were solemnly set apart for the work by the church at Antioch, and no doubt the support of that church followed them all the way. We have no definite information of what happened at Philippi; but at Thessalonica the apostle claims that he laboured night and day at his trade so that the burden of his maintenance should not fall on the community (1 Thess. ii. 9), and there too the Philippian church which he had just left sent him some measure of support (Phil. iv. 16). When he came to Corinth, he began by finding work at his trade along with Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 3); and here again we know that some support was forthcoming from Philippi[1] (2 Cor. xi. 9). The same principle was followed at Ephesus: with his own hands, as he reminds the Ephesian elders, he provided for the needs both of himself and of his companions (Acts xx. 34), and the Philippian Epistle, written, as we maintain, from Ephesus, shows that the Philippians were able there again to send to his support (iv. 10, 18)

From this it would appear that Paul would take nothing that might look like payment from those among

[1] The support, says Paul, came from Macedonia; but that Macedonia here means Philippi, without help from Thessalonica, is made plain by the statement in Phil. iv. 15, where the apostle says that after he left Macedonia the Philippians were the only church to send him a contribution.

whom he worked, but he was willing for the gospel's sake to accept support from churches which he left.[1] Behind this principle we may trace the apostle's high conception of the missionary vocation : into every city that he entered he came as one who had been ' sent,' and such support as was required ought, he felt, to come from those who joined in sending him rather than from those to whom he came. And in the Gentile world there was a special necessity for the adoption of such a principle. There a familiar figure was the philosophical or religious teacher who gathered around him his own pupils and lived by the fees they paid him. And had Paul not been careful, this is how he too would have been regarded ; and indeed part of the trouble which he had to face later at Corinth was that some of the brethren there, so far from understanding the principles of the Church of God, separated themselves into coteries according as they found Paul or Apollos the more attractive teacher.

This problem of missionary support had not been a live one in non-Christian Judaism, for most of the propagandist work that Judaism carried on among the Gentiles was done through the synagogue. To a missionary pioneer like Paul, however, whose work carried him far from his base, the issue was one which had to be faced. As a matter of theory Paul maintained strongly, buttressing his contention by appeals both to analogy and to Scripture, that ministers of the gospel had a right to receive financial support (1 Cor. ix.) ; but when the question arose as to the precise source from which that

[1] ἐξῆλθον in Phil. iv. 15 has probably this pregnant sense of going forth on a missionary crusade, cf. Mark i. 38 ; and it may even be, though this is more doubtful, that ' in the beginning of the gospel, when I went out from Macedonia ' implies ' in the beginning of the part which Macedonia took in the work of evangelisation.'

support should come, Paul saw clearly that if he received it from those whom he had already evangelised and from whom he now passed on to ' regions beyond ' he would safeguard his position from even the appearance of mercenariness (cf. *οὔτε ἐν προφάσει πλεονεξίας* in 1 Thess. ii. 5), and with regard to the Christians from whom the support came he would bind them in a strong bond of gratitude and service both to himself and to the converts he was winning in the new field.

This procedure might well have seemed to be beyond reproach ; yet it exposed Paul to attack from two quite opposite angles. It was said on the one hand that his refusal to accept pay from his disciples showed that he recognised his own defectiveness and as a missionary-preacher and teacher did not claim to be taken seriously, and on the other that by drawing to himself money from the churches he had left he was no better than a sacrilegious robber. So far as Corinth is concerned we see from 1 Cor. ix., where he deals with the matter at some length, that already before the writing of that epistle his attitude to the question of financial support had been made a subject of animadversion. In the Second Epistle, too, there are frequent hints of the cruel and unjust allegations that continued to be made against him. Clearly there had been loose talk about *πλεονεξία*—" we have wronged no one, we have ruined no one, we have taken advantage of no one " (*οὐδένα ἠδικήσαμεν, οὐδένα ἐφθείραμεν, οὐδένα ἐπλεονεκτήσαμεν*) he exclaims in 2 Cor. vii. 2 ; " did Titus make anything out of you ? " (*μήτι ἐπλεονέκτησεν ὑμᾶς Τίτος ;*) he asks indignantly in xii. 18 ; and his plans for the furthering of the collection-scheme in Corinth are justified by his desire that their donation should seem " a freewill offering and not an extortion " (*ὡς εὐλογίαν καὶ μὴ ὡς*

πλεονεξίαν, ix. 5). To this we may add Paul's frequent references to his poverty, and that notable outburst in vi. 3 ff. beginning : " giving no offence in any way " (or, " putting no stumbling-block in the path of any "), " that the ministry be not brought into discredit." But the most direct and succinct reference, which includes both the allegations referred to above, is to be found in 2 Cor. xi. 8 ff. First of all he takes up the allegation of ταπεινοφροσύνη (in the evil sense of self-demeaning, taking an inferior place), of which there are other hints in the epistle (cf. x. 1 ; xii. 21). " Did I err by ' demeaning myself,' as you say ? "—and here he adds parenthetically : " if there was any demeaning on my part it was that you on your part should be exalted "— " did I err by demeaning myself, in preaching the gospel to you free of charge ? " Turning next to the second type of allegation, that of sacrilegious robbery, he adds in a sentence whose point is not always brought out in translation : " I ' plundered other churches,' did I ? (ἄλλας ἐκκλησίας ἐσύλησα ;)—when as a matter of fact all I did was merely to receive support to enable me to carry on my ministry among you." And then, making use of a third catch-word [1] which was often on the lips of his opponents, Paul asserts proudly : " And when I was with you and ran short I sponged on none of you ;

[1] καταναρκάω : a rare word found twice in this epistle (in the active), viz. xi. 9 and xii. 13, and in only one other known case in Greek literature, viz. once (in the passive) in Hippocrates (Art. 816 C). The idea behind the simple verb is that of taking cramp, becoming numb ; and the compound with κατα- may therefore be taken as implying : to render numb, *e.g.* by squeezing hard. In both of the 2 Corinthians passages the reference is to financial pressure : Paul denies the charge that he has ever ' pressed ' them in any way, ever ' sponged on ' them. Thus in xi. 7 ff. Paul flings back in the faces of his opponents three opprobrious terms they had used against him.

anything that I needed was made good by the brethren who came from Macedonia."

This last reference provides a link with what Paul has to say about the bounty of the Philippians in Phil. iv. 10 ff. Not merely when he was in Thessalonica and at Corinth, but now again at Ephesus, shortly before the writing of the epistle, they had contributed to his support. How different was their attitude from that of the Corinthians! Here there was no malevolent criticism, no misunderstanding of motives, no readiness to take offence—nothing but practical goodwill, ready generosity, and a sympathetic appreciation of the apostle's missionary ideals. Paul's language in vers. 11, 12 has sometimes been thought to imply a certain unwillingness on his part to accept the position of debtor. If this is so, the reason may possibly have been that already his attitude to the general question of ministerial support was being criticised at Corinth (the matter had already been discussed there before 1 Corinthians was written, cf. 1 Cor. ix. 7 ff.), and knowing this he may have wished to convey to the Philippians a hint that any contributions they cared to send were accepted on the understanding that they were not personal gifts to himself, but contributions given for the furtherance of the gospel. Be that as it may, there is nothing grudging in his acknowledgment of the Christian spirit which inspired their action. From first to last the epistle glows with his appreciation of their missionary zeal. In Paul's letters it often happens that by a phrase or two in the opening paragraphs he reveals the thoughts that are uppermost in his mind as he begins to write; and in the Epistle to the Philippians it is noteworthy (*a*) that in the opening salutation he makes special mention of 'the bishops and deacons'—the latter had

perhaps given particular attention to the raising and forwarding of the financial contributions; (*b*) that in his opening prayer he gives thanks for the co-operation of the Philippians in the work of the gospel from the first day until now (i. 5);[1] and (*c*) the first piece of news he conveys to them is that even his imprisonment has been so over-ruled as to contribute to the advancement of the gospel.

[1] The phrase used is τῇ κοινωνίᾳ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. The word κοινωνία is used in Rom. xv. 26; 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 13, with special reference to 'the collection for the saints.' It would be a mistake to read that limited application into the phrase here—indeed, any reference to the collection is perhaps definitely to be ruled out (cf. pp. 237 f.); but the use of the word in those other passages reminds us that financial aid was a recognised way of contributing to the advance of the gospel.

CHAPTER XIX

OPPOSITION TO PAUL IN THE IMPRISONMENT EPISTLES

In the last chapter we traced the main tendencies in the growth of opposition to the apostle during those years that preceded his arrest in Jerusalem. The question therefore arises: how far are these same tendencies reflected in the Imprisonment Epistles, which on our hypothesis belong to the Ephesian period?

i. *Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon*

We need not delay here over Philemon, which is a private and personal letter, or Ephesians, which is general and constructive.

As regards Colossians, the trouble which is revealed there is occasioned by the growth of unsound doctrine, not by direct opposition to the apostle. The church at Colossæ was one which Paul had not himself founded and as yet had had no opportunity of visiting, and so it may well have escaped the attentions of his opponents and traducers. We have noted (p. 262) that in some of his churches Paul's Judaising opponents naturally developed their own line of teaching in direct opposition to his, but we have no reason to trace such an influence at work in the church at Colossæ. Owing to the use of the singular in the warnings of ii. 8, 16, 18, it has been suggested, with perhaps insufficient reason, that the promulgation of the new teaching is largely the work of an individual. Be that as it may, nothing is said which

would indicate that there is any personal hostility to the apostle ; and all that we know of the circumstances at Colossæ, including the fact that the church had been in existence for so short a time, and that Paul had so far had no direct relations with it, suggests that the real explanation of the prevalence of heretical doctrine was that a foundation of sound doctrine had not been well and truly laid.

ii. *Philippians*

In Philippians there are several passages which indicate opposition to the apostle. These we shall take up one by one.

(i) Chap. i. 15–18.—After the opening salutation, with its accompanying thanksgiving and prayer, Paul proceeds almost at once to mention the activities of certain rival preachers. It is clear, both from the drift of the preceding verses and from the reference to ' preaching Christ ' in vers. 16, 17, that such opposition as is here reflected is entirely within the Christian community. What Paul is here considering is the question how the community around him has reacted to the fact that their apostle has suffered impeachment and imprisonment. He would like the Philippians to know that in the main the imprisonment has been attended by certain consequences favourable to the cause of the gospel—apart from the fact that a new interest has been awakened among those attached to the prætorium, the majority of the brethren have been stirred up to take a bolder line in proclaiming the Word. He notes, however, that behind the zeal of some there lies a spirit of envy, rivalry, and partisanship ; and though these terms are employed quite generally, he also uses language indicating that this attitude

is directed in great measure against himself personally and is occasioned by the fact of his imprisonment. In other words, while his arrest and imprisonment, so far from delaying the progress of the gospel, has actually advanced it, while many have learned to appreciate more fully the challenge which the religion of Christ offers to the heathen world and to present that challenge with greater intensity and fearlessness, he cannot shut his eyes to one sinister feature of the situation, viz. that some of the preachers have taken occasion to dissociate themselves from the apostle whose personality and activity have brought down on him the wrath of the populace and the suspicion of the city authorities.

Can we go farther, and trace the opposition to any particular sect or party in the Church? Would it be safe, for example, to see in it the recrudescence of a narrowly Jewish form of Christianity? There was, it is true, a considerable Jewish section in the Ephesian congregation; and some of its members, stirred up by Jewish nationalistic opposition (whether the general opposition that emanated from Jerusalem, or the more particular opposition of Alexander and his fellow-Jews in Ephesus), may have tended to see in Paul, with his gospel of salvation for the Gentiles, a renegade Jew, a false apostle. No indication, however, is given us here of any outside agency as having come in to wreck the harmony of the community; and, not to dwell on the fact that an influence which was narrowly Jewish would have been more likely to undermine than to strengthen the confidence of Christian preachers, Paul would certainly have construed it as an influence hostile not merely to himself but to his gospel, and he would never have viewed it with the unruffled confidence displayed in ver. 18. We know from Galatians (i. 6–9) with what

passion the apostle could pour forth his soul when the truth of his gospel seemed to be impugned ; but here what he has to face is not a perversion of his gospel, but the fact that certain preachers are animated by unworthy motives, and that not in their relation to the gospel but in their relation to himself—and what does it matter that he is being attacked so long as the gospel is being preached ?

Any attempt, therefore, to explain more precisely the character of this rival preaching must begin by recognising that it was animated by personal hostility to the apostle. And bearing that fact in mind, we do not label the opposition as distinctively Jewish or distinctively Gentile. Paul does not say that the gospel which those others preached was in essence different from his ; it was rather that their feelings towards himself were feelings of rivalry and not of good-will, and that they were not sorry that his career had suffered interruption. Is it not therefore likely that here we have to reckon with a similar situation to that which is revealed in 1 Cor. i. 11 ff. (the two letters on our view belong to the same general period) where there were factions associated with the names of representative preachers ? And we remember how in Ephesus various Christian influences had been at work independently of Paul—there was *e.g.* the incipient Christianity of which we read in the case of Apollos and those other unnamed disciples who knew only the baptism of John (Acts xviii. 25, xix. 3) ; and Apollos, bringing after his illumination his own special training and experience to the interpretation of the gospel, seems to have profoundly impressed the Christian community (Acts xviii. 27). Acts tells us that he was an ἀνὴρ λόγιος (which perhaps implies that he had the gift of lofty eloquence), and was ' mighty in the scrip-

tures ' ; and his type of reasoning, based (shall we say ?) on an allegorical interpretation of scripture, and emphasising the gnostic rather than the ethical and spiritual side of his religion, may have appealed strongly to many, both Jew and Gentile, who were not disposed to admit the far-reaching implications of the faith so fearlessly propounded by Paul (cf. Acts xix. 8, 9). As an Alexandrian, he may have seemed to many in Ephesus a more typical representative of the thought and aspirations of Hellenistic Judaism than did the erstwhile pupil of Gamaliel. Others might recall how it was not till Paul came that the Christian movement among them had met with violent opposition and repression. Previously they had accepted the gospel of Christ without wounding the susceptibilities of their non-Christian Jewish brethren, or blatantly challenging the worship of Ephesian Artemis ; and so now they would feel with regard to Paul, much as in earlier days the Jerusalem Church must have felt with regard to Stephen, that it was his provocative attitude which had called forth the forces of repression and persecution. Paul's insistent demand for a living bond between the Greek-speaking churches and the church of Jerusalem must also have been distasteful to many who had little sympathy with his missionary ideals or the methods by which he sought their co-operation in the prosecution of these ideals. We recall that the cry of ἱεροσυλία, based on his activity in connection with his collection-scheme, had perhaps precipitated the crisis which had involved him in this, his first, imprisonment in Ephesus. For those reasons among others we can imagine that there were many among the Christians at Ephesus who, feeling that they had more affinity with Apollos or some other leader than with Paul, were eager to dissociate themselves from one whose impetuous zeal

had brought disaster to himself and caused difficulty and trouble for the whole Christian community.

(ii) Chap. i. 28 ff.—There is a vague and, for our purpose, unimportant reference to opposition in Phil. i. 28 ff. In this case the opposition is being encountered not by Paul but by the Philippians to whom he writes, and he appeals to the fact that they are suffering as he did. We need not, however, interpret this to mean that the Philippians are being cast into prison as the apostle had been when he had visited their city. It is enough to say that they are being persecuted just as he had been. There is no need to think that this persecution was Jewish in origin. Jews were not numerous in Philippi, and indeed were probably in bad odour there. We can imagine rather that the Christians of Philippi were suffering at the hands of their pagan fellow-citizens, and suffering because of their association with a movement which its traducers regarded as a turbulent brand of Judaism.

(iii) Chap. iii. 2 ff.—Here we come to a passage of first-rate importance. The opposition in this case must be clearly distinguished from that in i. 15 f. There it was a case of division within the community; here it is certainly opposition organised from without. Let us note, of course, that whereas in chap. i. Paul had in mind the church in the city of his imprisonment, here he deals with a danger which threatens the church to which he writes; but it is evident that the danger is not confined to any one church, and Paul writes as he does because he sees the Christian movement *as a whole* confronted with a danger which threatens its very life—the danger of a boastful, aggressive, and virulent Judaism. The danger is likely soon to assail the Philippian church, if indeed it has not already begun to do so; and the

warning the apostle now thinks it expedient to issue, perhaps in repetition of a previous warning (iii. 1), is based on the bitter experience he is having of similar trouble elsewhere, not least (shall we say?) in the city where he now lies a prisoner. The whole situation is illumined if we picture Paul as now writing from Ephesus. It is this Jewish hostility, he knows, that working its way westwards into all his Gentile-Christian communities has succeeded in interrupting his activity in the Asian capital, casting him into prison, and bringing him face to face with martyrdom; its machinations are even now revealing themselves in Corinth; and soon it will rear its head in Philippi. The apostle can afford to look with toleration on a proclamation of the gospel that is not inspired by the highest Christian motives (i. 18); but what the violence of his language here shows is that he is dealing with an enemy with whom there can be no truce—though, as he says in another letter written shortly after this (Rom. x. 1), his heart's desire and prayer to God for his nation is that they should be saved and brought to a knowledge of the truth.

It is clear that the Jewish opposition against which warning is issued in Phil. iii. 2 ff. is expected to come from without; in Philippi itself Judaism counted for little and there were probably few Jews in the Christian congregation there. A more difficult question to decide is whether the leaders of the opposition are or are not themselves members of the Christian church. The violence of Paul's language may seem to tell against the hypothesis that they are Christians; however much he might have differed from them on the question of circumcision, would Paul be likely to have applied such terms as 'dogs' and 'workers of evil' to those who were his brethren in Christ and to have done so without

any expression of eagerness to win them to his more spiritual view of the gospel? The argument, though weighty, is not wholly conclusive. Paul's opponents in 2 Corinthians are certainly Christians—they claim indeed to be apostles of Christ; yet he does not measure his words when, asserting that they are merely masquerading as apostles, he adds (2 Cor. xi. 14): "no wonder they do, for Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light"; and he applies to them in the preceding verse a designation very similar to that which he uses in the Philippians passage, ἐργάται δόλιοι, *deceitful workers*. Besides, Jewish propaganda was not likely to gain an entry into congregations which were predominantly Gentile, and to make sufficient progress as to become a menace, unless it worked through agents who were themselves Christian. We conclude therefore that the Jewish movement against which the Christian converts of Philippi are here warned to be on their guard was part of a world-wide protest which a narrowly nationalistic Judaism, concerned for its very existence, was at this time organising against the Gentile-embracing Christianity of Paul; but among its emissaries were many Jewish Christians, men who never allowed their Christianity to make them forget that first of all they were Jews, and it was through their agency that Judaism sought to accomplish its ends in the various Gentile congregations.

(iv) Chap. iii. 18 ff.—A fourth passage which may seem to have a vital bearing on the question of opposition at Philippi is Phil. iii. 18 ff., where the apostle tells regretfully of many who live as 'enemies of the cross of Christ.' Here we have a reference which, intelligible as it would have been to the readers of the epistle, is full of obscurity to us. Are the people against whom Paul here warns his converts to be regarded as within

the Church or outside of it? And again, are they Jews or are they Gentiles?

They are certainly not ordinary pagans. The fact that, while denouncing their way of life, the apostle appeals to his readers to copy his way rather than theirs, and accompanies his denunciation with reference to tears, shows clearly that they are bound to him by some close bond of national or religious sympathy. If therefore they are Gentiles, they are Gentile-Christians. But the bond may rather be that they are Jews, either within or without the Church. May we think of them as non-Christian Jews, over whom Paul agonises as he does over his nation in general in Rom. x. 1? On the whole this is unlikely. The whole trend of the passage suggests rather that, whether they are Jews or Gentiles, they are at least Christians.

The fact that they are 'enemies of the cross of Christ,' so far from placing them outside the Church, points decidedly to their inclusion within it. The cross of Christ, when represented as it was by Paul as a full and final revelation of the redeeming character of God, became a stumbling-block not merely to unbelieving Jews but also to many Jewish-Christians who were loath to abandon circumcision and the keeping of the Law as part of the basis of salvation; and one development of this tendency revealed itself about this time in the new teaching which had won its way into some of Paul's churches. In Philippians, however, the situation is quite different, for what we are concerned with here is not doctrine but morals. The cross of Christ in this epistle represents the supreme manifestation of Christ's 'self-emptying': taking on Himself the nature of a servant, He had allowed the spirit of obedience and self-humiliation to carry Him right up to death, and that too death on

a cross. The term ' enemies of the cross ' may therefore be taken to imply those who, though they profess Christian discipleship, are animated by a spirit wholly different from that of their crucified Lord.

That difference of spirit reveals itself in various ways. They ' think of earthly things,' a phrase whose meaning may be illustrated by the passage in Col. iii. 1 ff. as well as by Phil. ii. 5 ff. : forgetting that it was through earthly humiliation that their Lord came to His heavenly exaltation, they live with their affections set on the things of earth rather than on the things of heaven. In particular it is said that their God is their belly, their glory is in their shame. These are strong words ; to whom are they directed ? (*a*) It is not wholly impossible that they may be applied to Jewish-Christians who, instead of seeing their God revealed in Jesus Christ, must ever associate Him in their minds with the question of foods for the belly and the circumcision of their bodily members. But, apart from the fact that it is doubtful whether Jewish-Christians at Philippi were either numerous enough or influential enough to call forth such a warning, the words do not naturally suggest this interpretation, and even the language about ' dogs ' in ver. 2 scarcely prepares us for a denunciation of Christian brethren so violent, and, we may add, so unfair. If the error of these Christians lay primarily in their conservative adherence to Jewish customs, we cannot imagine Paul saying of them that the end marked out for them was destruction. It is therefore (*b*) altogether more likely that we have here a reference to certain Christians (probably Gentiles, though if there were Jews in the Philippian church they need not be altogether ruled out) who are leading lives characterised by intemperance and immorality. (Rom. xvi. 18 contains a similar warning

against nominal Christians who serve their own 'belly' rather than 'Christ our Lord.') That their sin lies in the misuse of the body is further indicated by the verses which follow (Phil. iii. 20 f.), where Christ is referred to as "a Saviour, who will transform the body of our humiliation and make it like in nature to the body of His glory." The references to their 'God' and to their 'glory' lead us also to think again of the two passages cited above, Phil. ii. 5 ff. and Col. iii. 1 ff. Christ subjected Himself to the will of God, and suffered extreme degradation; but as a consequence of His humiliation God exalted Him to glory, where now He sits at God's right hand. His followers are called to go through the same experiences in union with Him; but those brethren of whom Paul tells with tears obey not God but their own lusts, they are not content to attain to glory through suffering but seek it through abandonment to the things of shame, their thoughts are set not on the things above but entirely on the things of earth.

If the view taken above be correct, the 'enemies of the cross' against whom a warning is issued in iii. 18 ff. are in a quite different category from the 'dogs' and 'wicked workmen' of ver. 2 of the same chapter. Those latter were leaders and propagandists; these men whom we are now considering are rather ordinary members of the Christian community whose religion is still lamentably unspiritual. It is not to be wondered at if in the church at Philippi there were some who had little or no appreciation of the moral and spiritual grandeur of the Christian faith. For Paul's stay, when first he brought the gospel to them, had been short and disturbed; he had not yet, so far as we know, revisited them, though no doubt he had written to them in the interval (cf. iii. 1); even on the occasion of that first and only visit his

gospel had suffered, we may believe, by being interpreted merely as a Messianic or mystery cult; and among the pagans who were attracted to it were no doubt some who regarded it as offering to its initiates a form of 'salvation' which involved no need for self-discipline or advancement in the religious life. It is this thought, almost certainly, which lies behind Paul's veiled references to spiritual 'perfection' in vers. 12 and 15.

CHAPTER XX

CONCLUSION

i. *Supplementary Investigations*

THERE are obvious lines along which we might pursue our inquiries further.

(1) Linguistic Affinities

We might, *e.g.*, inquire how far the Imprisonment Epistles and (in part) the Pastorals show affinities of thought and language with other letters which are acknowledged to belong to the Ephesian period. We have already (p. 190) noted how certain phrases in Philippians are echoed in the passage 2 Tim. iv. 6–8 which we believe belongs approximately to the same time—it may have been written during the same critical period (the first Ephesian imprisonment) as Philippians was, though if it forms a unity with the section which immediately follows (vers. 9–22) it belongs rather to the third imprisonment. There is also an obvious parallelism in the thought and language of 2 Tim. iv. 17 f. and 2 Cor. i. 10 (cf. p. 194), where on our reconstruction Paul is referring in each case to the same experience of danger and deliverance.

It would be easy to institute similar comparisons.

Thus (*a*) in Phil. iii. and 2 Cor. xi. 12–22 we have quite a series of parallels: κακοὶ ἐργάται (Phil. iii. 2), ἐργάται δόλιοι (2 Cor. xi. 13); 'boasting in the flesh' (Phil. iii. 3, 4; 2 Cor. xi. 18); Paul asserts himself a true Jew (Phil. iii. 5; 2 Cor. xi. 22); 'evil-doers whose

end is destruction' (Phil. iii. 19; 2 Cor. xi. 15). Of other parallels in the same epistles we may mention: the contrast between being 'humiliated' and being 'exalted' (*ταπεινόω, ὑψόω*) in Phil. ii. 8 f. and 2 Cor. xi. 7; the linking up of the thought of such 'humiliation' with that of 'financial necessity' (*ὑστερέω*) in Phil. iv. 12, 2 Cor. xi. 7, 9; in Phil. i. 20 Christ is 'magnified' in the apostle, in 2 Cor. x. 15 the apostle is being 'magnified' in his converts; God is 'the God of peace' in Phil. iv. 9 and 2 Cor. xiii. 11; appeal is made in 2 Cor. x. 1 to Christ's 'gentleness' (*ἐπιεικία*), and the adjective *ἐπιεικής* occurs in Phil. iv. 5, apart from which we have it in the New Testament twice in the Pastorals, once in James, and once in 1 Peter, while the noun occurs in Tertullus's speech, Acts xxiv. 4; the verb *συνέχω* is found in Phil. i. 23, 2 Cor. v. 14, and otherwise (apart from Matt. iv. 24) only in Luke (6 times) and in Acts (3 times).

(*b*) Casting our eyes over other epistles, we may note the following parallels taken almost at random: *φόβος καὶ τρόμος* occurs four times in Paul, viz. Phil. ii. 12, Eph. vi. 5, 1 Cor. ii. 3, 2 Cor. vii. 15; the phrase *ἀναπληροῦν τὸ ὑστέρημα* (or some variety of it) occurs in Phil. ii. 30, Col. i. 24, 1 Cor. xvi. 17, 2 Cor. xi. 9. Apart from 1 Tim. vi. 17 the adjective *πλούσιος* occurs only twice in Paul, viz. 2 Cor. viii. 9 (applied to Christ), and Eph. ii. 4 (of God, as being 'rich in mercy'). This word and its cognates (*πλοῦτος, πλουτίζω, πλουτέω, πλουσίως*) are in Paul found only in the Imprisonment Epistles, the Corinthian Epistles, Romans, and the Pastorals—not in Galatians or in Thessalonians. *λειτουργός* is applied by Paul to Epaphroditus in Phil. ii. 25, to himself in Rom. xv. 16, and to civil rulers in Rom. xiii. 6.

Instances like the above might easily be multiplied. But now the question arises: what argument is to be based on them? They certainly do not in themselves provide proof that the Imprisonment Epistles belong to the same general period as 1 and 2 Corinthians and Romans (one might produce interesting linguistic parallels between the Imprisonment Epistles and Galatians, which on historical grounds we prefer to assign to a much earlier period); still less can they be used as an argument for dating one epistle within the group as earlier or later than another. Nevertheless they do provide evidence of an indirect kind which to the student of the epistles is of very great interest and significance.

(*a*) The parallelisms in expression, while they cannot be accepted as a direct argument for a contemporary date, may be taken to indicate a similarity in the general situation. The language in which the Judaistic menace is referred to in Philippians makes us at once link up the situation there with that seen in 2 Corinthians, so that after all an argument is provided *indirectly* for assigning both epistles to the same general period. Similarly behind the references to 'humiliation,' to 'financial necessity,' to 'richness,' and so on, we may see in the various epistles the same general situation, in which the apostle is defending himself against misrepresentations in regard to money-matters and is seeking to train his converts in the principles of Christian giving.

(*b*) Similarities in vocabulary may to some extent at least be due to the fact that Paul's letters seem to have been dictated; and it may be that in certain cases he allowed considerable freedom to his amanuensis. An interesting problem is raised by the parallelisms between

Philippians, the Pastorals, and the Lukan writings (with special reference to the speeches in the later chapters of Acts). One wonders how far confidential companions like Luke and Timothy acted as the apostle's secretaries in the writing of his epistles.

(*c*) Linguistic parallels, while providing in themselves no conclusive evidence regarding the date of writing, may be useful as corroborating results already reached on evidence of a more positive kind; and we believe that the similarities in language between the Imprisonment Epistles and the Epistles to Corinth and to Rome are sufficiently impressive as to provide an additional reason why the former should be assigned to the same general period as the latter.

(2) Affinities in doctrinal and ethical teaching

Another line of inquiry would be to consider how far affinities of doctrinal and ethical teaching may be traced in the Imprisonment Epistles (with perhaps the Pastorals) and the other letters of the Ephesian period. Something along this line was attempted in Chapter X, where, in rebutting the objection that certain conceptions in Colossians and Ephesians are too 'advanced' to be dated as early as the Ephesian ministry, we considered how far some of these conceptions are paralleled in other letters of the period, or (as regards, *e.g.*, the thought of the Christian Temple) may be partly explained by reference to certain historical happenings which we know belong to that period.

An obvious subject for further inquiry would be the development of Paul's thought on the resurrection. True as it is that Paul must have gloried ever since his conversion in the thought of the risen Christ, in two

respects there is a development which is common to all the epistles of the period under discussion.

(*a*) At the heart of Paul's *Weltanschauung* there now lies the triumphant thought that, thanks to the 'power' of Christ risen and ascended, sin and death and all the forces of this world have been robbed of their potency, and a new era has begun for the whole of God's creation. As a few illustrations of this thought we may cite Phil. ii. 9–11, Eph. i. 19 f., Col. i. 18, 1 Cor. xv. 20 ff., Acts xxvi. 23.

(*b*) Paul glories now, not merely in the resurrection of Jesus Christ (cf. Gal. i. 1), but in the resurrection of believers. How large a part this further conception plays in his thinking at this time may be seen by reference to Phil. iii. 11, Eph. ii. 6, Col. iii. 1, 1 Cor. xv. 12 ff., 2 Cor. i. 9, iv. 14, Rom. iv. 24 f., viii. 34 ff.—the resurrection being construed sometimes ethically, as a victory over sin, sometimes with regard to the future life, as a victory over death. There are frequent references to believers being 'presented' after the resurrection—shall we say as a bride to the bridegroom (2 Cor. xi. 2)?—cf. Eph. v. 27, Col. i. 22, 2 Cor. iv. 14, Rom. xiv. 10. Paul constantly emphasises the fact that the body, too, has its place in the resurrection, cf. Phil. iii. 20 f., 1 Cor. xv. 35 ff., 2 Cor. v. 1 ff., and with this we may link up his ethical teaching on the reverent use of the body. Finally, with his thought on the resurrection of believers we may connect his teaching on *νέκρωσις* in Col. iii. 5, 2 Cor. iv. 10; cf. 'being made to die as Christ died' (Phil. iii. 10).

Parallels such as these, though they cannot carry us far in the direction of exact dating of the various epistles referred to, are an impressive testimony in favour of our view that all these epistles belong to the

same general period. And perhaps we may go further and link up Paul's developed doctrine of the resurrection —(*a*) with his own personal experiences during the Ephesian ministry when death seemed constantly to lie in wait for him and, as he said, he died daily; (*b*) with the necessity of meeting certain heterodox interpretations of the Christian doctrine (based it may be on Jewish cosmological theories, or on the ideas of the mystery-cults with regard to a future life), or the tenets of those who denied a physical resurrection (1 Cor. xv. 12, cf. 2 Tim. ii. 18).

In the sphere of ethics we may seek to link up Paul's views on marriage in 1 Corinthians with his teaching on the duties of husband and wife in Colossians and Ephesians (as also with his teaching on the body as the temple of God, and his thought of believers in their risen state being presented as a bride to Christ). What he says about 'humiliation' and 'self-emptying' in Phil. ii. 7 f. may be paralleled in 2 Cor. viii. 9.

We shall make no attempt to pursue further this line of inquiry, but it is plain that, if the Imprisonment Epistles are to be assigned to the Ephesian ministry, much interesting and valuable work remains to be done in examining the doctrinal affinities which they have with the other epistles of that period.

ii. *Questions of Chronology*

Before we conclude our study let us take a hurried survey of the Ephesian period, seeking in particular to gather up data which shed light on questions of chronology.

Paul's ministry at Ephesus is probably to be dated during the years 52–5. Before coming he had kept 'the feast' (probably the Passover) at Jerusalem (Acts

xviii. 21, Western Text), and carried on evangelistic work in Galatia and Phrygia (xviii. 23); and so his arrival at Ephesus may be assigned to the summer or early autumn. For the first three months he was privileged to use the synagogue; and though he was then forced to find a new centre for preaching, he carried on work for two more years (xix. 10). In his address to the Ephesian elders Paul himself says, according to Acts xx. 31, that he was at Ephesus for a period of three years.

With regard to his departure, his intention, intimated in 1 Cor. xvi. 8, was to remain at Ephesus till Pentecost; and, despite an outbreak of that hostility which he had seen menacing him at the time of writing (1 Cor. xvi. 9), it is probable that his departure was not greatly delayed. We have two reasons for thinking so. (*a*) It was apparently still summer when he arrived at Troas, for, deciding there to fit in a hurried visit to Corinth, he left his cloak behind, meaning to get it on his return. (*b*) On retiring from Corinth he crossed again to Asia via Miletus, and being once more arrested he wrote urging Timothy to come before winter (2 Tim. iv. 21). As two sea-journeys and a visit to Corinth had intervened before this, it would appear that his departure from Ephesus must have taken place during the summer.

The outbreak of hostility to which we have alluded (viz. the Demetrius riot) is described for us at some length in Acts. From that narrative we get the impression that it took place shortly before the apostle's departure; it is a plausible hypothesis that the disturbance was associated with the celebration of the Ephesian *Artemisia*, which took place in March or April. As a result of this outbreak the authorities regarded it as prudent to put Paul under a mild form of

arrest; it was at this time that he wrote Colossians and Ephesians, and in a short note written at the same time to his friend Philemon at Colossæ he took occasion, foreseeing as he did his early departure from Ephesus, to indicate that before leaving Asia he hoped to visit Colossæ.

Previous to this imprisonment near the conclusion of his stay the apostle had passed through another and much more serious crisis at Ephesus. Through a gross misrepresentation of his activity on behalf of his collection-scheme the Jews of Asia organised an intrigue against him on the score of temple robbery. In view of the special edicts addressed by Roman authorities to the magistrates, senate, and people of Ephesus guaranteeing the rights and privileges of the Jews with regard to their temple offerings, the charge of temple robbery was one which no Roman governor could afford to treat lightly. Prompt and forcible action was called for on the part of the proconsul, and for a time, as we gather from Philippians (written at this period), the apostle felt his life to be in serious danger. In the end, however, Roman justice triumphed over Jewish bigotry and unscrupulousness, and the apostle was released.

Various considerations lead us to assign this earlier imprisonment to the summer preceding the apostle's departure, *i.e.* the summer of 54.

(*a*) Philippians, written at a time when the crisis, if not yet over, was at least less menacing than it had been at an earlier stage, indicates by the many recent sea-journeys referred to in it that the time is not so late as winter.

(*b*) After the crisis was over, the apostle sent off Timothy to Macedonia, as he had promised—a journey which would have been begun before winter set in.

Corroboration of this is provided by the absence of Timothy's name in the opening salutation of 1 Corinthians, from which we may argue that Timothy had left before that letter was dispatched (p. 137). When in the following spring trouble was occasioned by Demetrius, Timothy returned (the absence of any reference to him in the narrative of Acts suggests that he was not in Ephesus at the time of the riot), and he was with the apostle during the subsequent imprisonment when Colossians and Philemon were written. Hence it would appear that he had been with the Philippians during the winter.

(*c*) This first imprisonment occurred some time before the writing of 1 Corinthians, which we have shown by inferences drawn from the movements of Timothy to be later than Philippians, and 1 Corinthians was probably written about the beginning of the year 55 ; cf. the reference in xvi. 8 to the apostle's plan to leave at Pentecost. Further, the indirect way in which in xv. 32 the apostle alludes to his ' fighting with beasts ' clearly shows that some time had elapsed since that crisis—the apostle knows that the Corinthians have heard about it and will understand his allusion.

(*d*) We have ventured the hypothesis that Paul on this occasion found a friend in Junius Silanus the proconsul, to whose courageous handling of a difficult situation he owed his deliverance ; and it was in the year 54 and perhaps before the Demetrius riot (p. 106) that Silanus met his death.

Another more or less fixed point in our chronology is given by the apostle's departure from Corinth on his way to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 3). There are various reasons, including what is known of the supersession of Felix by Porcius Festus in the governorship of Judæa

(the date of which was probably 59), for assigning Paul's arrest at Jerusalem to the year 57 ; and as Paul arrived in the Holy City in time to keep the feast of Pentecost Luke's detailed narrative of the time spent on this journey enables us to date the apostle's departure from Corinth in or about the month of March of that year. This visit to Corinth had lasted for some three months (Acts xx. 3), so Paul's arrival there may be dated about January. We have postulated that he came from Nicopolis, where he spent the earlier part of the winter (Tit. iii. 12) ; and as the route was almost entirely a land one such a journey could quite well have been accomplished in December. We are thus left with a period of approximately eighteen months between the apostle's departure from Asia about Pentecost 55 and his final arrival in Corinth.

Eighteen months is a longer time than has generally been allowed for this period ; but we must remember how on our reconstruction the whole complexion of events is changed by the hypothesis that into this intervening period there falls the sorrowful visit to Corinth. We may note, too, that as the month of his departure from Ephesus and that of his arrival in Corinth are both approximately fixed, the only way to reduce the period would be to assume that he arrived in Corinth in the January immediately succeeding his departure from Ephesus—in other words, that the journey occupied only about six months ; but this we have shown (p. 219) to be an impossible hypothesis. We admit that when the apostle left Ephesus he had no thought of allowing more than one winter to intervene before his going up to Jerusalem with the collection. He hoped to arrive in Jerusalem by Pentecost 56, and with regard to the intervening winter it was still an open question with him

whether he would spend it in Macedonia or in Corinth. As it was, the necessity to pay a double visit to Corinth, his return to Asia and subsequent arrest, and delay in completing the collection preparations both in Corinth and in Macedonia combined to postpone his arrival in Jerusalem till Pentecost of the following year.

We proceed, then, to consider in more detail the events of those eighteen months.

The apostle left Ephesus in the summer of 55, his first objective being Macedonia. He was probably accompanied by Aristarchus, Demas, Luke, and Trophimus. When he was at Troas he decided to pay an emergency visit to Corinth; Aristarchus, however, went on as previously arranged to Thessalonica, and Demas deserted the apostle. After the visit to Corinth, which probably was of short duration, circumstances induced Paul to sail not for Troas but for Miletus; and somewhere in Asia (Laodicea ?) he was for the third time made the victim of Jewish hostility in Asia. From a short note written at this time to Timothy we gather that winter is now approaching: Paul asks Timothy to come before winter and to bring with him his heavy cloak.

Some time after his return to Asia the apostle addressed to Corinth his sorrowful letter. It would be written either during the third imprisonment or very soon after release; and while it would be concerned primarily with the apostle's relations to the Corinthian church, it would naturally have indicated that he was once again suffering for the gospel in Asia, so that when in a later letter (2 Corinthians) he dealt more personally with his experience at that time he clearly assumed (cf. 'the affliction,' 2 Cor. i. 8) that the Corinthians had already some knowledge of it. It is a reasonable assumption that the private note to Timothy would be dispatched

as soon as possible after the apostle's arrest and first 'defence'; the sorrowful letter to Corinth would follow at a later date, when the apostle had more leisure for such a task. This is confirmed by the fact that in the former of these letters Titus[1] is alluded to as still being in Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv. 10), whereas he is once more in Corinth at the time of, or soon after, the arrrival of the sorrowful letter, of whose reception by the Corinthians he subsequently brings news to Paul in Macedonia.

How long the apostle's third imprisonment continued we do not know. We may assume, however, that the sorrowful letter to Corinth would be written in the course of the winter and that it was in the following spring that the apostle, once again a free man, journeyed on from Troas to Macedonia, eager to get news of its reception. In the course of the summer of 56 Paul, having now met Titus, wrote 2 Corinthians, and dispatched it from Macedonia by the hands of Titus. He was now free to give time and attention to his long-desired missionary crusade in Macedonia, advancing from there to Illyricum and finally arriving at Nicopolis before the winter began. At some point in his travels he wrote to Titus, who was then in Corinth, asking him to meet him at Nicopolis (Titus iii. 12).

We may recall in closing how certain references to the progress of the collection fit into this scheme. Preparations at Corinth had been begun under the leadership of Titus, shortly after the receipt of 1 Corinthians (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 1), *i.e.* in the spring of 55; and this is confirmed by Paul's language in 2 Corinthians

[1] We may assume that when he was sent to Dalmatia Titus's instructions were to return soon from there to Corinth. Paul had, perhaps, expected that his own stay in Corinth would have been long enough to enable him to see Titus on the latter's return.

(written in the summer of 56) where he speaks of what had been accomplished ' last year ' (viii. 10 ; ix. 2).

iii. *The Large Number of Letters Written from Prison*

When we reflect that Paul devoted three years to his Ephesian ministry we cannot but be struck with the fact that of the six letters [1] which have survived from that period five were written while he was a prisoner. Nor is the proportion reduced if we include letters known to have been lost ; for while we can say nothing regarding the time when the earliest Corinthian letter, referred to in 1 Cor. v. 9, was written, we can with good reason assign the sorrowful letter to an imprisonment period.

No doubt it is true that Paul wrote letters when the need for them arose, and this would apply no matter whether the apostle was at the time actively prosecuting his missionary work or chafing under the restraint of imprisonment. But it need not surprise us if his correspondence increased during an imprisonment period, when new necessities would arise (cf. 2 Tim. iv. 9 ff.), when his sufferings would lead some of his churches to show their sympathy with him in a way which called for a letter of acknowledgment (cf. Philippians), and when above all he would have time both to meditate on the missionary situation in his various churches and to deal with it by letter.

Of the four Imprisonment Epistles one, Philemon, was directly occasioned by an event which happened to the apostle during his imprisonment, viz. his meeting with Onesimus. With regard to Philippians we would have at least a partial explanation of its origin during

[1] *I.e.* the four Imprisonment Epistles, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Timothy. We have purposely omitted here any reference to 1 Timothy.

an imprisonment if we could be sure that it was because they had already heard of his arrest that the Philippians sent the gift which is acknowledged in the letter—though there were other reasons also for the letter, among which we may mention a desire to explain his plans for his own visit to Philippi, and for the earlier visit of Timothy. Colossians reveals a situation which in all probability the apostle would have dealt with by a personal visit had he been free to do so, and so its origin during a period of enforced inactivity need not surprise us. Of Ephesians, on the assumption of its authenticity, we may say that it is just the sort of letter which would be written by one to whom for the time being action and utterance were denied; it is the product of deep and reverent reflection on the part of one of God's greatest prophets who, relieved for a little from 'the daily onslaught' of his missionary duties, has leisure to meditate in quiet on the 'mystery' of the gospel and to trace the working out in history of the divine purpose.

iv. *New Problems Opened Up by our Hypothesis*

With the solution of any one problem many new problems emerge. Among those which our present study opens up we may mention (1) that of the origin of the Pastoral Epistles. We have been content to refer to certain 'fragments,' whose genuineness cannot be doubted, and the setting behind which is clearly that of Paul's Ephesian ministry. The inquiry, however, cannot be left there; the question must be raised of the relation of these fragments to the letters as a whole. A fuller study of the letters will perhaps reveal that in many of their features (*e.g.* as regards the false teaching referred to in them) they reflect the general conditions of the Ephesian ministry. Nothing in their references

to ecclesiastical organisation makes so early a dating of them impossible. The main stumbling-block with regard to their genuineness (it applies much less to the question of date) is their vocabulary. Is it not possible that some contemporary of Paul's, *e.g.* Timothy himself, or more probably Luke, worked up certain verbal instructions of the apostle's and certain written communications of a personal character into the form which the Epistles finally assumed ?

(2) Another problem occasioned by the ascription of the Imprisonment Epistles to Ephesus concerns the growth of the *Corpus Paulinum*. Here we have a number of Paul's epistles, all of them the product of his Asian ministry, which tradition came to regard as written from Rome. To these is to be added 2 Timothy, which, despite the reference to Rome in i. 17, has been shown to have had originally no connection with that city. Have we here a tendency on the part of the Roman Church, going back to the beginning of the second century or even earlier, not merely to gather together a collection of Paul's letters (it was only natural that an important church should do that), but also to claim several, regarding whose place of origin the lapse of time had created some doubt, as having been actually written in Rome ? This tendency would, of course, have been facilitated by the fact that the letters in question all claimed to have been written from prison ; and the Roman imprisonment soon eclipsed in tradition the earlier and less important imprisonments in Ephesus, all the more so as the Book of Acts had nothing to say about these. There was the further fact that as regards Philippians the references to the ' Prætorium ' and to ' Cæsar's household ' could easily be taken as pointing to Rome. The probability that a tendency of this kind was at work

is enhanced by certain features in the Epistle to the Romans, viz. (*a*) the list of greetings in chapter xvi., which is almost certainly to be regarded as addressed originally not to Rome but to Ephesus: and (*b*) the textual variants in the epistle, which suggest doubts whether the document in its original form was an epistle addressed exclusively to the church at Rome.

To go a stage further, may we have here evidence of a rivalry between the two great churches of the East and of the West? While Ephesus gloried in its association with the apostle John, was Rome on that account all the more eager to assert as many links as possible with Paul?

There is the further fact to be noted, that apart from the Imprisonment Epistles and 2 Timothy there were no other letters of Paul which could be claimed as Roman in origin. We can scarcely imagine that the apostle, whose literary activity had been so great in the boisterous period of his Ephesian ministry, should have written no letters during the two comparatively quiet years he spent awaiting his trial in Rome. But if he did so they have not been preserved to us. We must indeed recognise the fact that we have no epistle of Paul dating from the period subsequent to his arrest in Jerusalem. It is a fact which all students of the apostle's career will learn with a sense of loss. Our knowledge of Paul's Roman imprisonment was always felt to be sadly meagre; now it is so reduced that we feel we know almost nothing at all. But we must not think merely of loss. If we may not keep watch with the apostle at the end of the long campaign, it is given to us, far more fully than we had dared to hope, to share with him in his trials at a time when the fight was at its fiercest. And in that we cannot but rejoice.

DATE	PAUL
Summer 52	Arrives at Ephesus.
Summer 54	First crisis—writes Philippians.
Autumn 54	
Winter 54–5	1 Corinthians written.
Spring 55	Second crisis (Demetrius riot) in March; writes Colossians and Philemon.
Summer 55	Proceeds to Troas; meets Titus; pays sorrowful visit to Corinth.
	Hurriedly leaves Corinth; returns to Asia; leaves Trophimus at Miletus.
Autumn 55	Third crisis (Laodicea ?); writes 2 Tim. iv. 9 (6 ?) ff.
Winter 55–6	Writes sorrowful letter to Corinth.
Spring 56	Advance via Troas and Macedonia.
Summer 56	Writes 2 Corinthians; evangelistic work in Macedonia and Illyricum.
Autumn 56	Summons Titus to meet him in Nicopolis.
Winter 56	Spends part of winter (Oct.–Dec.) in Nicopolis.
January 57	Arrives in Corinth (three months' stay).
Pentecost 57	Arrest in Jerusalem.

TABLE

TIMOTHY	TITUS (cf. pp. 223 f.).	GENERAL
At Ephesus.		
Goes to Macedonia.		Proconsul of Ephesus murdered.
	Goes to Corinth with 1 Corinthians	Luke joins Paul before Colossians.
Rejoins Paul.		Tychicus sent as bearer of Colossians.
Is left behind in Ephesus.	Meets Paul at Troas with disquieting news about Corinth; is sent on to Dalmatia.	Aristarchus goes on to Thessalonica. Demas deserts.
Summoned to rejoin Paul before winter, and to bring cloak.		"Only Luke is with me." Tychicus relieves Timothy at Ephesus.
	Returns to Corinth.	
Accompanies the apostle.	Meets Paul in Macedonia with news of the reception of the sorrowful letter.	
	Returns to Corinth.	

INDICES

(*To be supplemented by reference to the Table of Contents.*)

I. GENERAL INDEX

Accusations against Paul, 50, 261 ff.
Acts, 17 ff., 77 ff., 95 ff.
Affinities, of language, 11 f., 194, 212, 282 ff.
  of doctrine, 12 f., 122 f., 285 f.
Alexander, 32, 36, 202–4.
Apollos, 25, 26 f., 225, 273 f.
Aquila and Priscilla, 19, 25, 26 f., 68, 156 f., 207
Aristarchus, 32, 89 f., 94, 96, 148 ff., 196, 238, 240–2
Artemisia, 34, 140, 288
Asiarchs, 33 f.

Cæsar's household, 104, 108, 110 f., 208, 296
Church, teaching on the, 43, 49, 119 ff., 230 ff., 265
Collection for the saints, 42, 48, 53, 60, 150, 152 f., 175, 218, 229–49
Colossæ, false teaching at, 111 ff., 202, 270
Colossians, 8 ff., 12, 63, 70, 74–6, 92, 111 ff., 144 ff., 157–61, 249, 270, 295
Corinth, 22 ff., 165–83
  sorrowful letter to, 166, 182, 224, 292 f., 294
  sorrowful visit to, 136, 140, 165 f., 168 f., 175–9, 196 f., 200 f., 223 f., 291
Corpus Paulinum, 9, 296

Dalmatia, 207, 214, 220–4, 293
Demas, 93, 154, 191–3, 196 f., 206, 242
Demetrius riot, 32 ff., 92, 106 f., 139; see also under Imprisonments.

Epaphras, 74, 76, 89, 92, 147
Epaphroditus, 80 f., 84 ff., 238
Ephesians, 8, 43, 115 ff., 270, 295
Erastus, 77 ff., 192 f., 207, 238

False teaching, 202, 263, 295; see also under Colossæ.
Financial contributions, 50 f., 82 ff., 121, 263 ff.

Gaius, 32, 96, 151, 237, 241 f.
Galatians, 7 f., 63, 237, 255
Gallio, 23, 98 ff.

Illyricum, 220 ff.
Imprisonments of Paul, 66 ff.
  in Asia, 7, 124, 141–3, 144, 148, 195
  first imprisonment (Philippians written), 44, 106, 142, 153–61, 190, 215, 249, 289 f.
  second imprisonment (Demetrius riot; Colossians and Philemon written), 142 f., 153–61, 215, 288

Imprisonments—*cont.*
third imprisonment (2 Cor. i. 8 ff.; 2 Tim. iv. 9 ff. written), 143, 145, 195 ff., 203, 211
what imprisonment involved, 7, 109, 141, 158, 161
" fellow-prisoner," 68, 149

Jerusalem Council, 253 ff.
Jesus Justus, 93, 144, 147
Josephus, 25, 37, 39 ff.

Laodicea, 8, 40, 136, 189, 194–9, 207, 292
Luke, 90 f., 96 ff., 107, 154 ff., 207, 240 f., 285, 296

Mark, 90, 207
Miletus, 185, 192, 202 f.

Nazirite vow, 24 f., 52 f., 258
Nero, 99 ff.
Nicopolis, 217 ff., 291, 293

Onesimus, 72 ff., 161
Onesiphorus, 188 f., 193

Pastoral epistles, 7, 9 f., 184–225, 285, 295
Philemon, 72–5, 92, 114, 159, 294
Philippians, 9 f., 63, 77–87, 144–161, 271 ff., 285, 294; see also under Imprisonments.
Prætorium, 108 f., 208, 296
Priene, 189, 195

Resurrection, 118 f., 128, 286
Rome, 3, 18, 21, 60, 88 ff., 184–9, 296 f.
attitude of Rome to Christianity, 23, 27, 34, 45, 98 ff., 259, 289

Silanus, proconsul of Asia, 102 ff.
Silas, 8, 96

Temple, Paul's attitude towards, 42 f., 53, 120 ff., 231, 234 f., 285
temple-robbery, 38 ff., 45, 50, 59, 101, 106, 121, 249, 274, 289
Thessalonian Epistles, 8, 21, 23 f., 78
Timothy, 77 ff., 93 f., 137 ff., 184 ff., 238 f., 285, 296
Titus, 166, 180 ff., 201, 206, 214, 217 ff., 243 ff., 266, 293
Troas, 180–3, 192, 206, 212, 221, 223 f., 240
cloak and parchments left at, 185, 198, 201, 212, 288, 292
Trophimus, 53, 185, 192, 203, 248
Tychicus, 93 f., 197, 207, 224 f., 248

II. PRINCIPAL SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

Romans
xvi. 3 ff.: 68, 207, 208

1 Corinthians
iii. 16: 43, 122
iv. 17: 79, 137, 167
iv. 18–21: 167
xii. 27: 122
xv. 30–2: 59 f., 66 f., 70, 125, 126 ff., 290
xvi. 5–9: 3, 140, 158, 167–72
xvi. 10: 79, 137 f, 167

2 Corinthians
i. 8 ff. : 60, 67, 91 f., 131 ff., 140, 194, 197, 210, 292
i. 15 ff. : 168, 172 ff., 177
ii. 12 f. : 182, 201
v. 20 : 115
vi. 16 : 43, 122
viii. 6 : 244 ff.
ix. 2 : 245 f.
x. 15 ff. : 224
xi. 8 ff. : 267
xi. 9 : 83, 264
xi. 23 ff : 66, 95

Ephesians
i. 19 : 118, 286
i. 22 f. : 122
ii. 14 : 54
ii. 20–2 : 43

Philippians
i. 15–8 : 89, 271
i. 28–30 : 86, 275
ii. 19 ff. : 81, 137, 146
ii. 24 : 160
iii. 2 ff. : 275
iii. 10 f. : 118, 286
iii. 18 ff. : 277
iv. 5, 13 : 194
iv. 10 ff. : 82, 268

Colossians
i. 13 ff. : 116 ff.
ii. 8 ff. : 112 f., 116
iv. 3 : 157 f.
iv. 16 : 8.

Philemon 9 : 114

University of Southern California

BS2505 .D83
Duncan, George S.
St. Paul s Ephesian ministry.

93624

Duncan...
St. Paul's...

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CALIFORNIA